



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 4, 2008

No. 91

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 4, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ELLEN O. TAUSCHER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: You are all-powerful, Lord, and worthy of highest praise. Your power is great, and there is no limit to Your wisdom.

We, as Your people, as a Nation, are truly a tiny part of Your vast creation. Yet, we wish to praise You.

It is You Who move and act in any of us and take delight in our offering You praise. For You are to be found within us.

When we desire to create equal justice for all people, it is You Who plant the desire in us.

It is You Who plot out the ways we position ourselves for the future and lead Your people to insight and consensus.

When we long for peace in such a deep way that we are willing to lay down armaments and take our place at the table of negotiations, then we know it is You Who make us instruments of secure peace and begin the ending of hate and violence.

Lord, You have made us. You made us for Yourself so our hearts are restless now and we will not rest until we rest in You forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. CAPITO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

ENERGY AND GAS PRICES

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to urge my colleagues to join us in bringing down the price of gasoline and securing our energy supply.

Last December we enacted legislation that began to redirect our Nation's energy policy so it is clean, secure, and invests in our workforce.

In May we passed the Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act of 2008, legislation which gives the U.S. authorities the ability to prosecute those who engage in anti-competitive behavior, like the cartels such as OPEC.

Just last month we also passed the Renewable Energy and Job Creation

Act of 2008, which will provide needed investments and security to renewable energy and energy efficiency industries.

With the passage of all these bills and others, we are reducing our dependence on oil to bring down the record gas prices, secure our Nation's energy supply, and create hundreds of thousands of green collar jobs.

I urge my colleagues to help our businesses and consumers and struggling families to support all of these efforts.

AMERICANS DEMAND ACTION

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the American people are fed up with rising energy prices. They are fed up that the leadership here in Washington does not seem to have the will to step forward and make tough decisions so that we can begin to ease the pain at the pump.

I am proud to be working with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to try to bring real relief to the American people. In particular, I am proud to be supporting legislation such as the American Energy Independence and Price Reduction Act that would open up a small part of ANWR for energy production and exploration today and use funds obtained through the sale of land leases to invest in alternative energy sources for tomorrow.

These plans would adhere to the strictest environmental requirements in our Nation's history. This type of comprehensive approach is direct. It is timely. It is vital to building a stronger strategic energy portfolio.

The American people demand and deserve action.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4879

HONORING THE LIFE OF JACK MILDREN

(Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a remarkable Oklahoman.

Jack Mildren passed away on Thursday, May 22, following a 2-year battle with cancer.

Jack was born in 1949 and later was a Texas high school football star who chose to attend college in Oklahoma.

Known as the "Godfather of the Wishbone," Jack led the University of Oklahoma football team in an appearance in the 1971 "Game of the Century," along with being the MVP of a Sugar Bowl win. He's most widely recognized for laying the foundation for the success of the Sooner football program for years after his graduation. Jack left OU an Academic All-American and went on to play professional football for three seasons.

Jack was not only a football star but also a civic leader and an outstanding public servant. He was elected as Oklahoma's 22nd Lieutenant Governor. Most recently, he served as a banker as well as a beloved Oklahoma sports radio host.

Jack Mildren will not only be remembered by his wife, Janis; and children, Leigh, Lauren, and Drew; but by all Oklahomans for his contributions to the history of our State.

We will miss you, Jack.

CLEAN COAL-DERIVED FUELS FOR ENERGY SECURITY ACT

(Mrs. CAPITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam Speaker, I rise today because gas prices at the pump are just a symptom of our growing addiction to foreign oil and inaction by this House leadership.

For our wallets and for our national security, we need to become more energy independent. Congress should start now to develop more of our domestic energy supply. And one of those more affordable and abundant supplies of energy we have now is coal. With over 250 years of reserves, the United States has the world's largest coal reserves.

Last night I introduced H.R. 6170, the Clean Coal-Derived Fuels for Energy Security Act, to reduce our reliance on foreign oil. My bill is clear: It will establish and mandate 6 billion gallons of clean coal-to-liquid fuel by the year 2022. Coal can be converted through proven, existing modern technology into clean, synthetic oil and be economically viable, resulting in lower prices at the gas pump.

We need to be serious about becoming more energy independent. West Virginians deserve a comprehensive long-term solution that provides real

stability and actually leads to the creation of new energy. Coal-to-liquid fuel will create an investment in rural communities, good-paying jobs for Americans, and cheaper energy for Americans.

SUPPORT H.R. 3021, 21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3021, a bill that will help our local schools build the high-quality classrooms that our students deserve.

This responsible legislation, which we will consider today, provides for needed investments in public school facilities, investments that will result in improved student performance.

Our Nation's public school facilities are in disrepair. This is a disgrace, and it impedes our students' ability to learn. Local education agencies want to make a difference, but they need our help.

With our younger students, we know that maintenance issues draw them away from focusing on what they need to focus on in the classroom, when they see chipping paint, water dripping from ceilings, poor heating and cooling. We need to change that. And older students cannot be prepared for the 21st Century if they don't have a 21st Century classroom.

These examples are not just anecdotal. There is firm evidence that suggests that we must invest in our school facilities in order to improve students' performance. By failing to do so, we are sending our youth a message that we don't care about them.

So I hope that my colleagues will vote with the best interests of our students and vote on this legislation in the affirmative today.

AMERICAN ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Madam Speaker, it's high time Congress acts on high gas prices. The American people are crying out for help and assistance; yet this Democrat Congress is doing nothing when it comes to energy independence for Americans.

Finding a comprehensive long-term solution is what the American people want so that we can be energy independent, or at least more energy independent than we are today.

Conserving is a sign of personal virtue, but we cannot conserve our way to American energy independence. The Democrat plan is only conservation and it's only tax increases.

On our side of the aisle, we are trying to reach out to the Democrats and say

that we must have energy exploration here domestically.

When it comes to energy, America needs to rely on its own ingenuity and innovation, not the Saudi royal family.

LEADERSHIP DEMANDS ACTION

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, Americans are demanding action as they're being battered by sky-high gas prices.

The relentless unwillingness to act by this majority has left my constituents fuming and looking for action, not more of the same rhetoric and politics.

We sit at the precipice of four dollar gasoline. How much higher do these costs have to go before the majority will act? Five dollars? Six dollars? Ten dollars? Is the Democrat majority so out of touch with the American people?

On this side of the aisle, we have produced an action plan to increase access to new sources of energy, increase American production, encourage alternative fuels, and incentivize conservation. We are ready to act.

Madam Speaker, gas prices have increased 70 percent since you took control of Congress, and it's your duty to act. I call on you to allow the responsible Republican energy plan to come to this floor.

Madam Speaker, idleness is not leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

HELP OUR FAMILIES

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I learned yesterday from reports that the State of South Carolina has the lowest gas in the Nation. It was reported that the average gas price in South Carolina is \$3.79, and most other States have an average of about 20 cents higher or right at \$4.

A lot of people would think that's good news. In fact, some would give me the opportunity to congratulate South Carolina. But I'm not going to use this platform to deliver good news because it's not good news.

It's not good news to the South Carolina citizens or citizens anywhere in this country. What would be good news is to see that the "commonsense" energy plan that was promised by the majority party is brought to the floor.

I am tired of my families putting their hard-earned paychecks into their tanks every week, Madam Speaker. The American citizens need good news, and we need to bring energy legislation

to the floor now to help our hard-work-
ing families.

COAL TO LIQUID AS AN ALTERNATIVE ENERGY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, according to the Energy Information Agency, the United States currently imports 60 percent of its oil, and that number is expected to rise to 75 percent in the coming decades. As a country, we need to reduce our dependency on foreign fuel sources and start implementing alternative energy sources that can be found here in the United States.

Imported fuels such as crude oil and natural gas are costing this country millions of dollars a year, accounting for about one-third of the U.S. trade deficit. At \$45 a barrel, liquid coal fuel is a desirable alternative to the \$120 or more barrel of oil. Not only does this innovative fuel cost less, but also coal is one of the most abundant resources in our country.

As Congress continues to explore the use of alternative energy sources, we need to look closely at the enormous benefits of coal-to-liquid technology.

PENCE DEMANDS ACTION ON HIGH GAS PRICES

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. The national average cost of gasoline at the pump today is \$3.98 a gallon. When I was home over the Memorial Day break, one Hoosier after another stopped and asked me the same question. They said, MIKE, what is it going to take? What is it going to take for Congress to take action to give the American people more access to American oil?

The reality is today that the Democrat majority thinks that we can tax our way to lower gasoline prices. A few weeks ago, they actually passed legislation suggesting we could actually sue our way to lower gasoline prices. But the American people know the only way to lessen our dependence on foreign oil is to lessen our dependence on foreign oil.

We must take action now to allow additional drilling in environmentally responsible ways on American soil off American shores so the American people can increase global supply, reduce the price of oil, and bring real relief to families and businesses and farmers at the pump.

ENVIRONMENTALISTS HAVE GONE BATTY

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, out on the arid, dusty high plains of west Texas, where the land was once the home of thousands of oil derricks, the landscape is now dotted with windmills—the new turbine clean energy. Texas is the wind energy capital of North America, supplying power to over 1 million homes.

But now the environmental fear lobby wants to stop these turbines because they may pose a threat to bats and birds. They are the same radicals who have successfully prevented America from drilling for more crude oil at home, like in west Texas. These are the same batty people who have demanded we go to wind energy in the first place.

Now they are worried about the bats and the birds that fly at night may be running into the windmills. Of course, there is no evidence to support this bat mania claim. Anyway, we all learned in third grade bats have a radar-like ability to navigate at night in caves and open terrain. The National Academy of Sciences stated: Birds have more to fear from high buildings, power lines, and cats than they do from the blades of windmills.

We cannot allow the rich elites of the environmental fear lobby to destroy America's energy production. Otherwise, we will all end up going back living in the dark caves, with the bats.

And that's just the way it is.

WHY ISN'T AMERICA DOING MORE?

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, back home in Texas I visited with families whose cost is so high that one woman in Bridge City told me she doesn't even go to Wednesday night church. She can't afford to drive to it. Just on Sunday. I talked to small businesses that now work, painters and plumbers and others, who now basically work for free because gas prices have eaten up all their profits. I visited this last week with our law enforcement agencies, who are no longer able to be proactive in the community. They are just responding to calls because they burned through much of their fuel budget for the year already.

In each case, every one of them asked me, Why isn't America doing more? Why isn't America taking more responsibility for our own energy needs? We import two-thirds of all we use. We are capable of doing more. In each case, they said, Look, take a message back to Congress. No more gimmicks. No more gimmicks. We need more American-made energy here in the United States to get our fuel prices down, to be less dependent on Middle East fuel, to have some say over the prices that our families and small businesses pay.

COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY STRATEGY

(Mr. BOUSTANY asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as oil prices continue to climb, increasing American energy production is critical to meeting this challenge. Yesterday, the Department of Energy announced a \$715,000 grant to my alma mater, the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, to develop more effective ways to drill for oil. Students and professors will work together, along with industry, to achieve higher energy yields from each drilling hole. Better exploration and drilling procedures and techniques are just two parts of a comprehensive energy strategy that we need to have because a magic bullet will not solve our energy challenges. It will not lower the price at the pump alone. We need a comprehensive strategy.

People of southwest Louisiana and around the country want to increase responsible energy production, they want to see increased refining capacity, they want to unleash American entrepreneurship and ingenuity to solve our energy problems, and they don't want any further delays because gas at the pump, as you can see, is just short of \$4 a gallon.

We have to stop the delay and have a comprehensive energy solution. I challenge the Democratic leadership to work with us and stop the delay. Let's get a solution to our energy problems.

RESULTS OF NOT DEVELOPING AMERICAN ENERGY

(Mr. AKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AKIN. As America is becoming painfully aware, there has been a result of us not developing American energy. We have reports of police cars sitting idle because of the cost of gasoline; various assembly lines and automobile manufacturers closed down because of the fact that there's no demand for the type of vehicles that are being produced. We have a situation where parents have a hard time just putting enough gasoline in the tank to get the kids to school. And we have the AAA saying that the increase in motorists without gas has increased 15 percent.

Since Speaker PELOSI took office, gasoline prices have skyrocketed 71 percent. Now, I am an engineer. The good news is there's a solution to this. It's called American energy. We need to stop looking at the American energy as something that is an environmental hazard and rather look at it as an asset that we can develop.

The Democrats, year after year after year, 85 percent of the time, are voting against increasing supplies of American energy. We have to develop our own energy.

AMERICAN-MADE OIL AND GAS: A HISTORY OF SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION

(Mr. CONAWAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONAWAY. As you see, the theme this morning is to talk about gasoline prices, and as we look at the various solutions that are available to our country, it's interesting to note how votes happen in this House. It's rare that a particular position is supported or opposed 100 percent by either party. But let me walk you through a couple of solutions that have been voted on in this House over the last 14 years.

Drilling in ANWR; 91 percent of Republicans supported it, 86 percent of Democrats opposed it. Coal-to-liquids; 97 percent of Republicans supported it, 78 percent of Democrats opposed it. Oil shale exploration; 90 percent Republican support, 86 percent Democrat opposition. Drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf, 81 percent of Republicans support it, 83 percent of Democrats oppose it. Increased refinery capacity; Republicans support that by 97 percent, Democrats oppose it by 96 percent.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to begin to look rationally at the solutions that will help address America's need for energy, gasoline and electricity as we move forward.

A POLICY OF "NO" IS NOT WORKING

(Mr. NEUGEBAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Madam Speaker, it's not working. The policy of "no" to producing America's resources is not working for the American people. Today, America will write a check for \$1 billion to buy enough energy to run our economy for one day. Let me repeat that. Today, America will write a check for \$1 billion to run our economy for one day. That means for the year, it takes \$365 billion to export to other countries that have said "yes" to developing their resources.

Think about what we could do with \$1 billion if we invested that in developing American resources; the jobs that it would create, the fact it would make America more independent and less dependent on those other countries.

The policy of "no" is not working. We need to say "yes" to producing more of America's resources; "yes" to drilling in areas where we have found abundant resources; "yes" to using a 250-year supply of coal; "yes" to building new nuclear power plants; "yes" to developing America's resources, reinvesting in America.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to bring legislation to the floor that will help

America build a stronger energy independence.

DRILL NOW IN ANWR

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. I just returned from the Middle East. I went with a bipartisan group to Saudi Arabia, to the United Arab Emirates and to Kazakhstan and talked to the folks who have oil about what we can do internationally to bring the price down, bring the supply up, do whatever it takes to give middle class Americans some relief at the gas pump. It was interesting the response that I got.

Number one, I can tell you without question the Middle East is happy with the current gas prices. We all know that they are enjoying the wealth which we are transferring over there. But the thing that they said to us, How dare you come to Saudi Arabia, how dare you come to the United Arab Emirates, how dare you come to Kazakhstan and ask us to reduce our prices when you won't even drill for oil yourself. You won't even build refineries. Yet you want us to do something. You can do it for yourself.

Think about this, ladies and gentlemen. ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve, is the size of South Carolina. The proposed drilling area is 2,000 acres. That is smaller than the average airport. Yet, for some reason, we are afraid to drill there. That is absurd. We need to drill now.

WE NEED AMERICAN ENERGY PRODUCTION

(Mr. MCCOTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCOTTER. Over the recess, I had the opportunity to meet with a manufacturing community in my district; talk to managers, talk to owners, talk to employees. The one thing they all agree on is the cost of American energy is adding to their fixed costs at the very time international pressure is forcing them to reduce the cost of their product. In short, they're facing the nightmare scenario of energy prices forcing them to lay off workers in the manufacturing sector or to, unfortunately, terminate their employment altogether.

What we need in the United States is American energy production, conservation, and free market innovation if we are to protect these jobs and help these workers. It is very cold comfort for the people of Michigan and the manufacturing workers of the United States to hear that some day a green collar job will come and take away your blue collar job. When you're putting them out of work today, the prospects for tomorrow look much more bleak than they do to some academic or to some politician who is engaging in rhetoric that

somehow the government will innovate us out of this effort.

We need American production to help protect manufacturing jobs and help provide prosperity for the American people.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 311) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 311

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SOAP BOX DERBY RACES ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the "Association") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races, on the Capitol Grounds on June 21, 2008, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Association shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Association is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code,

concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event to be carried out under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 311.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 311 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the annual Soap Box Derby. As all Members are aware, this is an annual event held here on Capitol Hill. Activities planned for this event will be coordinated with the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and, like all events on Capitol Hill grounds, will be free and open to the public.

The 2008 Greater Washington Soap Box Derby will take place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Third Streets, Northwest, on June 22.

□ 1030

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby has been held on the U.S. Capitol Grounds since 1991 and has attracted over 60 youth participants in each of those years.

In 2007, for the first time in the 66 year history of the D.C. Soap Box Derby, a local participant won the Masters title in the national competition in Akron, Ohio. The All-American Derby Youth Program is administered by the International Soap Box Derby, Incorporated, an Akron-based non-profit corporation. This is a family-oriented event and is supported by hundreds of parents and volunteers.

I urge support for the resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLM of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 311, sponsored by the majority leader, Representative HOYER, authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 67th Annual Washington Soap Box Derby on June 22, just a couple of weeks away, this year. For many years, Majority Leader HOYER and Congress have supported this fun event, which allows children to show off their hard work and their creativity as they compete for trophies and the opportunity to race others in competition.

Boys and girls between the ages of 8 and 17 will race down Capitol Hill in

homemade cars, hopefully without injury. Winners in each of the three divisions go on to compete in the National Soap Box Derby in Akron, Ohio. Last year, the Soap Box Derby marked a historic event when racer Kacie Rader won both the District's race and the national title in her division.

I support this resolution, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

The authorization of the use of the Capitol Grounds is part of the managerial work that we do here in Congress. But the issues the American people want addressed are being ignored. While Americans struggle, particularly in my district, to put fuel in their cars, we authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds. Gas prices are soaring above \$4 in many parts of the country and this Congress must act. We must work to find a way to ease the burden of increasing fuel costs.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLM of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. I am just real pleased, Madam Speaker, to be able to stand up and speak in favor of this, because this is a great example of conserving fuel for America. These cars don't run on gasoline or diesel. These kids are just going to let gravity take its course. I guess this trucker from Houston that I met with this last week who told me that he took a load from Houston to San Diego and got paid \$1,800 and his fuel costs were \$1,700, he probably wishes it was all downhill from Houston to San Diego so he wouldn't have to pay the kind of fuel costs that are being imposed upon the American public.

The American public is asking this House to address this issue. I don't think anybody who went home and talked to their constituents this last week could not have found out that people are frightened at the cost of fuel. Single parents are concerned that they can't get their children to school. They are concerned they are not able to get to do shopping. They are having to choose between food or fuel in families across our country. It is time to use American energy intelligently.

As we look at this great race, which I support, I am excited for these young people and I think it is really Americana at its best. But using America's resources wisely is also Americana at its best, and our citizens expect us to find and use the fuel that is available for them to bring these prices down.

I encourage my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us on this side of the aisle in trying to find new sources of fuel from all over this Nation, from Alaska to the Gulf of Mexico to offshore. It is important to America. It is important to our families.

I thank you for allowing me to express my opinion.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, today I rise as a proud sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 311, legislation which will allow the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to hold the 67th Annual Greater Washington Soap Box Derby on the grounds of the United States Capitol on June 22nd.

Soap Box Derby racing in our Nation's Capital has a long and rich tradition. In 1938, Norman Rocca beat out 223 other racers to win the Inaugural Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, which was held on New Hampshire Avenue. Over the years, thousands of the region's young people have participated in this great race.

Although the location has moved from the original site on New Hampshire Avenue to Capitol Hill, with stops on Massachusetts Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue and Eastern Avenue along the way, the essence of the race has remained the same; homemade, gravity-powered cars, the spirit of competition, and the pure joy of racing. Community groups, police departments, fire departments and other sponsors sponsor children each year, children who may not otherwise be able to participate.

The Soap Box Derby is not simply a race, Madam Speaker; it is an enriching way to reach out to our youth and teach them the importance of community, responsibility, hard work and innovation.

The Soap Box Derby consists of dozens of drivers, both boys and girls, ranging in age from 8 to 17. These racers are divided into three divisions; stock, super stock and masters. The local winners of each division will automatically qualify to compete with racers from around the world in the 71st All-American Soap Box Derby in Akron, Ohio, on July 26th.

Madam Speaker, this event has been called "the greatest amateur racing event in the world." It is an excellent opportunity for contestants from the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia to learn basic building skills while gaining a real sense of accomplishment.

Further, I hope that this year's winner from the Greater Washington area will have the same success as one of last year's participants, Ms. Kacie Rader. Kacie's win in Washington was only the beginning. Not only is Kacie a constituent and a neighbor, she also is the 2007 All-American Soap Box Derby Masters Division champion.

I strongly encourage my colleagues to join with me and the other original cosponsors, Representatives FRANK WOLF, JIM MORAN, ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON and CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, in supporting this resolution.

Mr. KUHLM of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may

consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

I think it is wonderful that we are talking about the Soap Box Derby. It is a good thing that it doesn't require any energy or any gasoline, because the gas prices in this country are higher than I think anybody would have expected in our lifetimes. It is about \$4 a gallon now, and people are asking me in my district, what are we going to do about this? What can we do about it?

Well, we should have done something about this a long time ago. The principal reason we are seeing these high gas prices is because we are far too dependent on foreign sources of energy. Why is that? Well, I know that as this one Member from Ohio can tell you, I voted 11 times in the last 14 years to open ANWR in Alaska for exploration and drilling. We think we have somewhere between 10 and 16 billion barrels of oil there. Unfortunately, we have handcuffed ourselves and put that off limits.

We also have the Outer Continental Shelf, where we have upwards of 86 billion barrels of oil and huge amounts of natural gas. If we had access to that natural gas, we wouldn't see the high heating prices for heating one's home in the wintertime.

But this is essentially the policy that this new majority here in Congress has put into effect. In reality, over the last decade, decade-and-a-half, even though they were in the minority in the time, they were able to block it over in the other body, in the Senate. So we had the votes here in the House to do it, but they didn't have the votes over there.

When you put huge amounts of energy like that off limits, it means we have to get that oil somewhere, so that means, unfortunately, we have to import it from OPEC nations, for example, who literally just keep the spigot turned down so that there isn't enough supply out there. Then when you have economies in India and China expanding and growing, it is a supply and demand issue. So the price goes up and continues to go up, because we are far too dependent on buying that oil from somewhere else. About two-thirds of our oil we buy elsewhere.

I know when the new Speaker of the House, Ms. PELOSI, took over here, a few months before the election she made the statement that the gas prices were outrageous. They made a big campaign issue about that. At that time they were \$2.30 a gallon. She said that was outrageous, and they had a plan to do something about that. Well, the plan that we have seen from this new majority here in the House of Representatives has resulted in it going from \$2.30 a gallon to about \$4.00 a gallon in less than 2 years.

So the problem is this new majority that talks about an energy policy, and they actually passed an energy bill recently, it was a no-energy bill, because

it didn't open up ANWR, it didn't open up the Outer Continental Shelf. It did nothing about making it possible for us to build oil refineries in this country.

We haven't built an oil refinery since 1976, over 30 years, making it virtually impossible to build an oil refinery. Therefore, even if we had enough crude in this country, we couldn't refine it quickly enough to be able to put it in our cars.

They have also been instrumental in pushing for these boutique fuels, where different States have different blends so the supply is very difficult to get around. That has driven the price up.

Also the liberals here in the House of Representatives over the years, and in this country, for that matter, their policy has been no new nuclear power plants. Now, France has 80 percent of their electricity produced by nuclear power plants. About 20 years ago, the liberals in this country were able to effectively shut down new nuclear power plants being built in this country. We have over 100 of them right now, but that means we haven't built any newer ones. China and India and other countries around the world are building them and relying more and more upon nuclear, but not the United States.

Many of us said what we are seeing now was where we were heading if we didn't change these policies. Unfortunately, this new majority here in the House of Representatives has gone just in the opposite direction from where they need to go. They have restricted us. They continue to restrict us from getting access to new energy which we have under our control in this country. They keep saying, let's just buy it from someplace else. Let's buy it from the OPEC countries. They will be nice to us. Well, they are not being nice to us. It is in their economic interests to continue to have this price continue to go up.

It is an absolute shame. It is a disgrace. It is unconscionable that this Congress consistently votes to make it harder and harder to be energy self-sufficient. That is where we need to go, not being more and more dependent upon foreign sources of energy. If we don't change it, the prices that we see right now, which are extremely high and are hurting an awful lot of people, will continue to go up.

Diesel is another problem. If you talk to any truckers right now, the price now is driving a lot of these people out of business. I was visiting with a fellow who is a farmer in my district last Friday who also has a side business. He had a truck. He pointed out it was behind one of his barns. He said, "I just park it now." It costs \$1,500 to fill up his tanks in that truck now. He just can't afford to do it.

□ 1045

And that is affecting every American, because everything that we buy, whether it is furniture, whether it is food goods, almost anything that we purchase in this country is transported

at some point or another over truck. That means those prices are going to continue to go up again. So I challenge this majority to change their policies, to take a good look at what they have been doing and the direction that we are heading and reverse that and allow us to become less dependent on foreign sources of energy. Let's bring these gas prices down before it cripples this country and cripples our economy.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Texas has 15½ minutes. The gentleman from New York has 10 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California, Representative DOOLITTLE.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I have watched over the years on energy what has been happening in this country. Now we are in a big mess, with gasoline prices over \$4 a gallon. This didn't just happen by accident; the Democrats have been working to make this happen for the 18 years that I have been a Member of this House. Very interesting.

You know, ANWR exploration, House Republicans, 91 percent of us supported drilling in ANWR. Actually, both houses of Congress in 1995, I believe it was, passed legislation directing drilling in ANWR, and President Bill Clinton vetoed the bill. The Democrats opposed this bill. If we had passed that legislation, if President Clinton had signed it into law, we wouldn't be paying \$4 a gallon. And while 91 percent of House Republicans supported drilling in ANWR, 86 percent of House Democrats and President Clinton opposed it.

Converting coal to liquid, 97 percent of House Republicans voted to do that. Do you know that Wyoming is considered the Saudi Arabia of coal in the world? It is one of our greatest natural resources. 97 percent of Republicans voted for that policy to allow the conversion so that it could be used; 78 percent of House Democrats opposed it. It never became law.

Oil shale. We have got lots of oil locked up in shale in the Intermountain West; 90 percent of House Republicans supported oil shale exploration, 86 percent of House Democrats opposed it.

Is there a pattern that you are beginning to see here, Madam Speaker? The fact of the matter is, Republicans have supported every feasible possibility for new forms of energy and it seems like the Democrats, most of them, have opposed it.

I am a Californian. We ought to be drilling right now off the coast of California and Florida and every other place in this country where there are large oil reserves, and there are very large oil reserves in those two cases.

Eighty-one percent of House Republicans voted to do that; 83 percent of House Democrats opposed taking that action.

Increasing refinery capacity. We have heard that we haven't built a new refinery in this country for some 35 years. Ninety-seven percent of House Republicans voted to expand the amounts of refineries; 96 percent of House Democrats opposed it.

Madam Speaker, we didn't get here by accident. Democrats have been talking about energy and opposing effective new ways of developing energy. Republicans' talk has been consistent with our actions.

Now, not all Republicans voted the way I would have liked and not all Democrats voted against our position. But the fact of the matter is, you see these statistics, they have been in the 90th percentile, the high 80s; in one case it was 78 Democrats opposed, 78 percent for the coal to liquid. But everything else I have cited, they have been 83 percent or higher opposed to these policies.

It is no accident gas is \$4 a gallon. The policies we vote on do make a difference. Listen and look at the record. The Republicans for years have been trying to get more energy for this country. The Democrats have opposed it. We are reaping a bitter harvest of \$4 a gallon plus.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the Congresswoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, please let me set the record straight on congressional action on gas prices.

We now have a law, it is the farm bill, the historic investment in affordable biofuels, and beefed-up oversight on market manipulation. The President's veto was overridden on May 21 of this year. We also have the Renewable Energy and Job Act. It was passed on May 21 and there is a threat of a veto, but it was passed. Then, the Gas Price Relief for Consumers Act, holding OPEC and oil companies accountable for price fixing, and it passed on May 20, it is also under a veto threat.

Now we have a law, Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act. It was passed on May 13 and it had a pretty hefty vote to take it out of this House, it is now law. Let's set the record straight.

We also repealed subsidies to profit-rich big oil companies, and invest in renewable energy. It also is under veto threat. It passed here at the beginning of the year, February 27. We also have a law, Energy Independence Law with Market Manipulation Ban & New Vehicle Mileage Standards. It is now law. It passed the House last year on December 18, 2007.

We have another bill that is under a veto threat, a crackdown on gas price gouging. It passed the House on another pretty hefty vote that was bipartisan; it passed on May 23. And, Hold OPEC Accountable for Oil Price Fix-

ing, it passed on May 22 on a vote of 345-72, and it is under veto threat.

Now, Madam Speaker, you are going to hear that the Democrats aren't doing anything, but let me give you the exact votes on all of these bills.

The Republican leader, JOHN BOEHNER, voted "no" on OPEC price fixing, oil fixing. He voted "no" on price gouging. He voted "no" on renewable energy. He voted "no" on energy security.

ROY BLUNT voted "no" on OPEC price fixing, "no" on price gouging, and "no" on renewable energy.

ADAM PUTNAM voted "no" on price gouging and renewable energy.

THADDEUS MCCOTTER voted "no" on renewable energy and "no" on energy security.

And it goes on and on and on.

So to set the record straight, we are putting out sound bills to address the oil, shall I say, surge in price, because in my city of Los Angeles I was astounded when I got home to see that Diesel 2 sells in Los Angeles on the average for \$4.99.9. I am sure when I get back to Los Angeles in a week it will be \$5. The average price of gas in Los Angeles, in my district, and really throughout California, is \$4.12 a gallon.

Madam Speaker, we are proposing good and sound legislation to address the needs for energy and renewable energy sources in the United States of America so our constituencies can get back and forth to work and enjoy a better life, and so we need the help of the other party because this should not be an issue that is partisan. It is an issue for America.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, in closing, I would ask my colleagues to support this bill. It is a very meritorious bill. And while the legislative action of this Congress idles relative to energy legislation, certainly the kids of America should be able to carry on tradition. I support and applaud Leader HOYER for bringing this resolution to the floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I do have one additional request for time. I yield 3 minutes to Congresswoman KAPTUR from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentlelady for yielding to me, and will place quite a bit of information in the RECORD on what Democrats are trying to do here in order to put America on an energy independent path. But it is pretty difficult when you have a Bush administration that vetoes everything that we try to do, or threatens it, and you have the kind of speeches that are occurring down here today.

We have got an oil man as the President of this country. His right-hand fellow over there from Wyoming, Mr. CHENEY, ran Halliburton, an oil servicing company. So you pretty well know what you have got sitting over there in the White House.

Since they became President and Vice President, this country is import-

ing 1 billion more barrels of oil every year, 1 billion barrels more under the Bush administration. This is not a recipe for energy independence in our country.

This week it was embarrassing to see Secretary Paulson over in Abu Dhabi asking them to, gee, you know, still believe in the dollar, and all of the investors over there made rich by these oil petro dollars, largely U.S. dollars, watching our Secretary give that set of remarks. Similarly, President Bush a couple of weeks ago went to Saudi Arabia and sort of drilled around in the Middle East to see if he could find any additional sources of supply, begging the oil barons.

You know, it wouldn't take that much for him to direct his limousine right up here to Congress, not the Middle East. We have got some rooms over here on this side; we could sit around and talk about what can we agree on in terms of energy independence, what can we agree on here in order to do together what we cannot do alone. Make America energy independent.

As the gentlelady from California said, the President even vetoed the farm bill where we put in a major new title dealing with biofuels. Rural America wants to help lift this country to energy independence.

We are trying to get additions to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve suspended for the moment in order to give some price relief to the American people. Gee, it would be great if President Bush would kind of help us out on that.

He hasn't supported any of our renewable energy bills down here on the floor. In fact, if you look at the energy bill that he produced up there, that big report in his first term, he doesn't even deal with renewables. When you have got an oil perspective at the head of the machine, the car doesn't go in the right direction.

And so it seems to me, look at the record. Look at what he has done and not done on these—The Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act, no support there. Trying to get OPEC and the big oil companies to have some accountability, he doesn't support us on that. Rather than the President taking trips over to the Middle East, he ought to just come right up Pennsylvania Avenue here to the Congress. Meet with the chairs of our committees who really do care about this, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MARKEY, Speaker PELOSI. We have got a lot of people here willing to talk. But the President is sending the Secretary of the Treasury over to Abu Dhabi and he himself over to Saudi Arabia. What does that tell the American people? A billion more barrels a year imported every year since he became President.

We don't have a partner to deal with over there at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. And that is why the American people are changing the people being elected here. They know America needs change. They want real leadership. They know they are not getting it.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it is time to deal. Get the President. Let's talk about something serious for the sake of the Republic.

Here's a list:

**DEMOCRATIC-LED CONGRESS TAKING ACTION
TO BRING DOWN THE COST OF GAS**

PASSED THIS MONTH

Strategic Petroleum Reserve Fill Suspension and Consumer Protection Act—Congress has enacted legislation to suspend the fill of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve through the end of the year, as long as the price of crude oil remains above \$75 per barrel. This is a critical first step for hardworking families, businesses and the economy, which in the past has brought gas prices down. The President, who was previously opposed, suspended shipments and signed the bill because of overwhelming bipartisan support in Congress.

Renewable Energy and Job Creation Act—This legislation will extend and expand tax incentives for renewable energy, retain and create hundreds of thousands of green jobs, spur American innovation and business investment, and cut taxes for millions of Americans. These provisions are critical to creating and preserving hundreds of thousands of good-paying green collar American jobs. A recent study showed that allowing the renewable energy incentives to expire would lead to about 116,000 jobs being lost in the wind and solar industries alone through the end of 2009.

The OPEC and Big Oil companies accountability bill—This bill will combat record gas prices by authorizing lawsuits against oil cartel members for oil price fixing, and creating an Antitrust Task Force to crack down on oil companies engaged in anticompetitive behavior or market manipulation. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

RECENT ACTION

Energy Independence and Security Act in 2007—Historic energy legislation with provisions to combat oil market manipulation, increase fuel efficiency to 35 miles per gallon in 2020—the first congressional increase in more than three decades, and promote the use of more affordable American biofuels. Signed into law on December 19, 2007. Under new requirements in the Energy Independence Law and pressure from Congress the FTC announced on May 1, 2008 it would investigate allegations of market manipulation that may have led to last year's record price spikes in gasoline prices.

Reduces our dependence on foreign oil—cutting our consumption of oil by 2.9 million gallons per year in 2030—more than what we currently import from all Persian Gulf countries combined.

Lowers energy costs for consumers with oil prices projected to decline from more than \$100 per barrel to \$57 per barrel in 2016 (in 2006 dollars) in part due to the new energy law.

The new fuel standard for cars and trucks will save American families \$700 to \$1,000 per year at the pump.

Reduces global warming emissions by 2030 by up to 24 percent of what the U.S. needs to do to help save the planet.

Building, appliance, and lighting efficiency standards will save consumers \$400 billion through 2030.

Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act—This legislation would end unnecessary subsidies to Big Oil companies, invest in clean, renewable energy and energy efficiency, and help reduce global warming. The bill includes provisions that will generate hundreds of thousands of green jobs including an estimated 70,000 solar energy jobs,

more than 20,000 biodiesel jobs, and protect an additional 75,000 wind industry jobs. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

Energy Price Gouging Prevention Act—This bill will provide immediate relief to consumers by giving the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) the authority to investigate and punish those who artificially inflate the price of energy. It will ensure the federal government has the tools it needs to adequately respond to energy emergencies and prohibit price gouging—with a priority on refineries and big oil companies. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels (NOPEC) Act—Legislation to enable the Department of Justice to take legal action against foreign nations for participating in oil cartels that drive up oil prices globally and in the United States. President Bush has threatened to veto this bill.

Energy Market Manipulation Prevention—The new Farm Bill increases Commodity Futures Trading Commission oversight authority to detect and prevent manipulation of energy prices. President Bush has vetoed this bill.

□ 1100

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I would like to close, Madam Speaker, by simply saying that this resolution was a resolution to allow the International Soap Box Derby, an organization that's a nonprofit based in Akron, Ohio, to use the Capitol Grounds, and I fully support that.

I want to call attention to one thing. In January of 2001, the month that this current President took office, gas was \$1.47 a gallon. Today, the national average is \$3.81, and I just want that for the record, with all the other comments that have been made on this particular bill for the Soap Box Derby.

I urge the passage of the permission to allow the Soap Box Derby to use our Capitol Grounds.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I support House Concurrent Resolution 311, to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

I especially want to acknowledge the dedication of Mr. HOYER, the resolution's annual sponsor, who faithfully introduces this resolution to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for such a worthwhile event.

This annual event encourages all boys and girls, ages 9 through 16, to construct and operate their own soap box vehicles. The event is supported by hundreds of volunteers, and parents.

It is an excellent opportunity for parents to have direct involvement in their children's activities. The derby's mission is to provide children with an activity that promotes technical and social skills that will serve them throughout their lives.

The derby organizers will work with the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police to ensure the appropriate rules and regulations are in place.

I urge my colleagues to join me in agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 311.

Mrs. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 311.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE
CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR A CELEBRATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY**

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 335) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a celebration of the 100th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 335

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR 100TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION OF ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY, INCORPORATED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor"), shall be permitted to sponsor a public event (in this resolution referred to as the "event") on the Capitol Grounds to celebrate the 100th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on July 17, 2008, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous materials on H. Con. Res. 335.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

House Concurrent Resolution 335, introduced by my friend and sorority sister, Ms. DIANE WATSON from California, is a bill to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 100th anniversary of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, and this anniversary event is scheduled for July 17, 2008. The event coordinators will work with the office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board regarding staging the event with all events on the Capitol Grounds, and will be free and open to the public.

This sorority was founded on the campus of Howard University 100 years ago. Ms. DIANE WATSON is a 50-year member. I'm a 35-year life member. And it was founded by nine visionary young women at the time, Ethel Hedgeman Lyle, Anna Easter Brown, Beulah Burke, Lillie Burke, Marjorie Hill, Margaret Flagg Holmes, Lavinia Norman, Lucy Slowe and Marie Woolfolk Taylor. The Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority is the oldest Greek-letter organization established for African American college-trained women.

The formation of the sorority during this moment in American history is significant because it helped jumpstart a movement of educated African American women who were resolute and determined to eliminate barriers for African Americans at a time when opportunities were limited for minorities.

These courageous young women, one generation removed from slavery, were the forebears of an entity that has progressively evolved into an organization of 200,000 plus members and 975 chapters in both the U.S. and abroad.

Today, membership in this organization represents a diverse constituency of women, from educators to heads of state, politicians, lawyers, medical professionals, media personalities, decision-makers of major corporations.

Built upon the principle of service, scholarship and sisterhood, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority extensively works to improve social and economic conditions through community partnerships and programs. These cornerstone values of the sorority will be on full display in the coming weeks as members, young and old, from across the globe come to our Nation's capital to honor the organization's 100th anniversary.

More than 20,000 members of the sorority will converge upon Washington, DC from July 11 until July 18. Members will participate in a variety of empowerment forums, lectures, workshops, community service activities centered on these principles throughout the length of the convention.

During this week-long celebration, members will reflect on 100 years of achievement, enjoy the unbreakable bonds of sisterhood, and look to the future as the organization prepares for the challenges of the next 100 years.

As a proud member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, I extend my congratulations and very best wishes to all of my sorors as they gather here in our Nation's Capital, birthplace of our sorority, to pay tribute to 100 years of service, scholarship and sisterhood.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this resolution authorizing the use of Capitol Grounds for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

This resolution authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 100th anniversary celebration of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. AKA, Alpha Kappa Alpha, was founded in 1908 on the campus of Howard University, right here in Washington, DC. The sorority performs various community service projects and encourages its members to contribute to the community, while pursuing academic excellence.

The centennial program on the Capitol Grounds will be just one part of the year-long celebration. The event will be free and open to the public.

Alpha Kappa Alpha will assume liability for accidents and will be responsible for event costs in accordance with the policies of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police.

While we debate this concurrent resolution, which is strictly a managerial responsibility of this Congress, people across the country are worrying about how they will afford their next trip to the gas station, and not about this particular celebration.

Since the Democrats took over Congress, the price of gasoline has increased more than a \$1.50 a gallon. It's unfortunate, but Democrats seem to ignore the law of supply and demand.

What you've heard here previously on the resolution before the House dealt with opening up the supply that's immediately available in this country, American energy supply. The current majority has done nothing to increase energy supplies, and then wonder why gas prices continue to soar. It is simply unbelievable that the Democrat majority refuses to debate the skyrocketing costs of fuel.

Madam Speaker, while I do support this resolution and request my colleagues to be likewise supportive, I would reserve the balance of my time at this time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to Representative DIANE WATSON of California.

Ms. WATSON. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas.

I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335 which authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds on Thursday, July 17, for a celebration of the 100th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated.

In January of this year, the sorority began its year-long celebration of its 100-year anniversary. Founded in 1908 on the campus of Howard University in Washington, DC, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated is the first Greek-letter organization founded by African American college women.

Alpha Kappa Alpha is a sisterhood of women who have consciously chosen to improve the socioeconomic conditions in their city, in their State, in the Nation and in the world. Its history tells a story of changing patterns of human relations in America in the 20th Century. The small group who organized the sorority was just 1 generation removed from slavery.

Through the years, the sorority directed its efforts towards improving the quality of life for all mankind, while living our sorority's motto, "by culture and by merit."

I am so proud to count myself and EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON as members and proud members of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. Throughout the years, I have witnessed firsthand how the power, vision and commitment of our founders and members have inspired Alpha Kappa Alpha to endure and prosper through 10 decades.

I encourage my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 335, which will ensure that a vital component of the 100th anniversary celebration will take place on these distinguished grounds of the United States Capitol.

I want you to know, our membership is very tuned in to the issues that we face domestically and we face internationally. And they would want to see all of us be able to benefit from the legislation that is passing both Chambers and going to the Governor to reduce the prices of oil, to address our infrastructure, to provide the right to health care for every American, to be sure that Americans can receive and realize the American dream to home ownership.

I am so proud to stand here in support of H. Con. Res. 335, to allow our membership to come in and get into this progressive atmosphere and to celebrate their 100th year of existence.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a celebration of the 100th anniversary of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated. I am pleased to support this resolution and recognize the contributions that the Alpha Kappa

Alpha Sorority has made to strengthening networks that cut across racial, geographical, political, and social barriers. This event is a fitting tribute to the organization and I congratulate the sorority on its 100th anniversary.

The commitment of Alpha Kappa Alpha members to public service is long and legendary. The sorority has evolved over its 100-year history from a college-based organization in support of young women in their intellectual and cultural development to an organization that dedicates itself to a variety of humanitarian programs.

These programs include the Mississippi Health Project, the Educational Advancement Foundation, and the IVY AKAdemy. The IVY AKAdemy program promotes early learning and mastery of basic reading skills, enhances the school experience of children and young people through hundreds of local programs around the country and in South Africa. For members of AKA, community service and sisterhood are life-long commitments. Many members of Alpha Kappa Alpha stay active in the organization for more than 50 years.

It is fitting that the Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority celebrates its 100th anniversary here on Capitol Hill.

I urge my colleagues to join me in agreeing to H. Con. Res. 335.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 335, a bill to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 100th anniversary celebration of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated.

Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority was founded on January 15th, 1908 by nine visionary women at Howard University. As America's first Greek-letter sorority founded by and for African American women to improve life for all African Americans, Alpha Kappa Alpha is truly celebrating a long tradition of commitment to sisterhood and service.

Driven by these noble ideals, Alpha Kappa Alpha has evolved into one of the world's leading service organizations with 975 chapters and approximately 200,000 members worldwide. One of those members, in particular, is near and dear to my heart. Mariama Carson, my lovely wife shares in the unique bond that is found among the sisters of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority. I truly believe her dedication to service was fostered through her membership in Alpha Kappa Alpha, and has helped her development as an accomplished and successful teacher in Indianapolis. She, like many of her fellow sorors, chose Alpha Kappa Alpha as a means of self-growth through volunteer service.

Madam Speaker, AKA's have touched the stars of our universe through members like Dr. Mae Jemison and have brought conscience to this body through members like Congresswoman SHELIA JACKSON-LEE and Ms. Erika Barrera, Communications Director for Congressman BRUCE BRALEY. But their stories are not isolated cases.

Throughout its 100 years of history, Alpha Kappa Alpha is full of women who have emerged as leaders in their professions and communities. Through distinguished members like Liberian President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf; actress Phylicia Rashad; and the 102-year-old Mrs. Hazel Hainsworth Young, one of the Sorority's most senior members, Alpha Kappa Alpha has and will continue to be an organization of focused and compassionate women committed to changing the world.

Madam Speaker, I am proud and honored to support this resolution; because I believe this sorority has and will continue to be an amazing organization that helps to better communities around the world. I hope all my colleagues will join me in granting Alpha Kappa Alpha the use of the Capitol Grounds and supporting their 100 year anniversary.

Mr. KUHLE of New York. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I urge support of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of our time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 335.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES M. & THOMAS W.L. ASHLEY CUSTOMS BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3712) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1716 Spielbusch Avenue in Toledo, Ohio, as the "James M. & Thomas W.L. Ashley Customs Building and United States Courthouse," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 1716 Spielbusch Avenue in Toledo, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the "James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3712 as amended is a bill to designate the Federal building located at 1716 Spielbusch Avenue in Toledo, Ohio, as the "James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley United States Courthouse".

The late Congressman and Governor James M. Ashley and former Congressman Thomas W.L. Ashley served their Ohio constituents for over 30 years as Members of Congress and Governor. The Ashley family has served with distinction in public service for a span of almost 100 years in the state of Ohio.

James Monroe Ashley served five terms as a Republican Congressman from Ohio. Governor Ashley's best known Congressional achievement was as the primary sponsor of the resolution which is recognized as the antecedent of the thirteenth amendment which abolished slavery within the United States and its territories.

While in Congress, James Ashley also became the chair of the House Committee on Territories, leading the congressional effort to organize Nevada, Idaho, Arizona, Wyoming, and Montana.

As chair of the House Committee on Territories, he wrote the enabling act for Nebraska, Colorado, and Nevada on which he conditioned that a separate vote be held by these potential member States that would prevent them from establishing slavery without the consent and approval of Congress.

With this measure, Ashley, an avowed abolitionist, signaled that no new slave States would be admitted to the Union. After serving in Congress, James M. Ashley was appointed Governor of Montana in 1869 by President Ulysses S. Grant.

Thomas William Ludlow Ashley was the great-grandson of former Governor and Congressman James M. Ashley. Congressman Thomas Ashley served in the United States Army during the Second World War. He went on to graduate first from Yale University in 1948 and from the Ohio State University Law School in 1951.

Congressman Ashley later held several positions as a private lawyer and a member of the media. In 1954 Congressman Ashley was elected as a Democrat to Congress and went on to serve a total of 13 terms in Congress.

While in Congress, Congressman Ashley served as chairman of the Select Committee on Energy and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Congressman Ashley also served as the assistant majority whip for the Democratic Party. Congressman Ashley's most prominent legislative success was PL 89-117 which directed the Federal Government to assist in the provision of housing for low and moderate income families.

This law was the precursor to the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development which was created later in that same Congress. After leaving Congress in 1981, Ashley went on to found a legal and consulting firm in Washington, DC. Congressman Thomas W.L. Ashley currently resides in the Washington, DC area.

James Monroe Ashley and Thomas William Ludlow Ashley will be remembered as distinguished public servants to the great State of Ohio.

The Ashley family served as leaders in both the Democratic and Republican Party in Ohio and each served their party well.

They will be respected as great Americans whose dedication to public service was passed down through the generations. As such, it is very appropriate that the United States Courthouse in Toledo, Ohio, be designated as the "James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley United States Courthouse".

I recognize the gentlelady from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for as much time as she may consume.

Ms. KAPTUR. I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3712, which seeks to name the Federal Courthouse Building located in Toledo Ohio, the James M. Ashley and Thomas W. Ludlow Ashley Customs Building and United States Courthouse.

□ 1115

This deserved recognition of two well-known lawmakers from the Ashley family, whose roots run deep in America and our community, pays tribute to the lives of late Congressman and Governor James M. Ashley who served here in the 19th century, as well as his great-grandson, former Congressman Thomas W. Ludlow Ashley, who served here during the 20th century.

These visionary Americans who lived in three different centuries advanced America's promise and the cause of social justice as they made immeasurable public service contributions to both define and direct the course of our Nation, one in the abolitionist fight to eliminate slavery in our Nation, and the other to bind up America's wounds in the civil rights era to help our Nation gain its idealistic foothold again.

Congressman James Ashley, who served in our U.S. House of Representatives from December 1859 to March 1869, was an active abolitionist credited with introducing the first bill for the 13th Amendment to our constitution to abolish the practice of slavery. He also drafted a bill to abolish slavery in Washington, DC. These extraordinarily brave actions in his era are illustrative of Ashley's courageous leadership. They reflect the Ashley family's place in history on the scales of justice and equality for all people.

During his tenure in Congress, James Ashley served as chairman of the Committee on Territories, and he was later appointed Governor of Montana. Congressman Thomas Ludlow Ashley, great-grandson of James Ashley from Lucas County, Toledo, Ohio, served a quarter century, 13 terms, from January 1955 to January 1981. During his tenure, he served as the chairman of the Select Committee on Energy where he was chosen by then-Speaker Thomas Tip O'Neill to prepare comprehensive legislative proposals across congressional committees to regain America's energy independence.

During that era of the 1970s, that landmark legislation, the Energy Conservation Act of 1976, and subsequent Carter administration energy independence proposals became America's first step on an arduous journey into a new energy age.

He also served as chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marines and Fisheries and as assistant majority whip for the Democrats in the House.

Lud was an outstanding leader in both community development and energy policy. As Chair of the Housing and Community Development Subcommittee for the Banking Committee, he, like his great-grandfather before him, championed social justice. He wrote and gained passage of the Demonstration City Act and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and 1977 to rebuild America's cities and communities in the wake of the civil rights era.

Indeed, the very establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development during the Lyndon Johnson administration was made possible by Lud's effective and dogged congressional leadership. Housing for the less fortunate and more sustainable communities across our country were made possible through his unyielding and creative efforts. A banker's banker, he also gained passage of the Bank Merger Act of 1966, the Export Development Administration Act of 1969, the Export Expansion and Finance Act of 1971.

A World War II hero, Congressman Ashley also served in the U.S. Army prior to his service in the U.S. House. Subsequent to his career in Congress, Congressman Ashley founded a consulting firm in Washington, DC, and now resides in Traverse City, Michigan.

I would ask my colleagues to please join me in supporting this bill in honor of two centuries of a family's service to America by the Ashley family and their two outstanding sons whose commitment to America is historic. Ohio is proud to claim these two favorite sons, men of principle, as people who changed America for the better.

I thank my dear colleague from Texas, Congresswoman JOHNSON for yielding to me. I thank Congressman KUHL, and I thank the leadership here for allowing us from the proud Buckeye State of Ohio to place the Ashley family's name on our revered Federal courthouse in perpetuity.

Mr. KUHL of New York. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio, Representative KAPTUR.

H.R. 3712 designates the Federal building and United States courthouse located in Toledo, Ohio as the "James M. Ashley and Thomas W. L. Ashley Customs Building and United States Courthouse."

James Mitchell Ashley was an Ohio congressman who served five terms in the United States Congress where he served for 8 years as the chairman on the Committee of Territories. Representative Ashley had a prominent role in the passage of the 13th amendment, which abolished slavery. Following his service in Congress, James Ashley served as the Governor of the Territory of Montana, as you have previously heard, and helped to construct

the Toledo, Ann Arbor and Northern Railroad.

His great grandson, Thomas William Ludlow Ashley, also served as a congressman from Ohio from 1955 to 1981, some 26 years. Representative Thomas Ashley served 13 terms in Congress, and was chairman of the Select Committee on Energy in the 95th Congress. Prior to his service, he served in the Pacific theater during World War II as a corporal in the United States Army.

This bill is a fitting tribute to their service and to their country. I support this measure, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

While this legislation will name a courthouse in Ohio, it is not on the issue or not on the minds of people across the country as they travel to work. They are more worried about the cost of filling up their gas tanks than they are the managerial actions of Congress' naming a building after some very honorable people. The American people are really feeling the pain at the pump, and this Congress has ignored their calls for help. It seems that, every night, the news media proclaims that the gas prices have hit another record high. As Congress idles and as prices soar, the problem is being ignored. This is something that Congress must act on immediately.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues to support this resolution as it is a fine, honorable, memorable tribute to a wonderful family from Ohio.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 3712, a bill to designate the U.S. courthouse located at 1716 Spielbusch Avenue in Toledo, Ohio, as the "James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley United States Courthouse." This bill was introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, to honor two members of the Ashley family, James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley.

The Ashley family has a distinguished record in public service dating back to the mid 1800s. Various members of this family have served in the U.S. House of Representatives since 1858.

James Monroe Ashley, 1824–1896, served five terms as a Representative from Ohio. During the American Civil War, Congressman Ashley was the first Representative to call for an amendment to the United States Constitution to outlaw slavery. The amendment he sponsored served as the antecedent to the thirteenth amendment of the Constitution, which abolished slavery.

Thomas William Ludlow Ashley is the great-grandson of former Governor and Congressman, James M. Ashley. In 1954, Thomas William Ludlow Ashley was elected to Congress served a total of 13 terms in Congress. While in Congress, Representative "Lud" Ashley served as chairman of the Select Committee on Energy and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In 1977, Speaker Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill established a Select Committee on Energy and appointed Congressman

Ashley to chair the Committee, which compiled energy legislation based on bills reported by several House committees in response to President Jimmy Carter's legislative proposal.

This bill is a fitting tribute to two distinguished public servants.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the bill.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move that we support this resolution for a very deserving family.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5599, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 1716 Spielbusch Avenue in Toledo, Ohio, as the 'James M. Ashley and Thomas W.L. Ashley United States Courthouse'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS JEFFERSON CENSUS BUREAU HEADQUARTERS BUILDING

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5599) to designate the Federal building located at 4600 Silver Hill Road in Suitland, Maryland, as the "Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building".

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State in 1790, supervised the first modern census in world history;

(2) the 1790 census was the first national census in the United States and the first periodic census in the modern nation-state era;

(3) Jefferson urged President Washington to veto the first apportionment bill presented by Congress on the grounds that it was unconstitutional, and Jefferson's own apportionment formula was adopted and used until 1840;

(4) Jefferson's mastery of numbers and statistical analysis helped alert the Nation to the importance of accuracy in the numbers used to describe the society and pointed to methods that later improved census taking;

(5) Jefferson offered population corrections to the European diplomatic community to more accurately convey the fast-growing United States population, which had been undercounted in previous census taking;

(6) Jefferson believed in the importance of territorial expansion and insisted on equal representation for the territories that were to join the Union as States;

(7) Jefferson supervised the first census in world history that gave to the people more

than it took from them, being designed less to extract taxes or raise a militia than to apportion political power to the people of the United States according to their numbers; and

(8) Jefferson's role in establishing a republic based on principles of representation underscores the historical significance of the United States census and the way the Government views and governs itself today.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 4600 Silver Hill Road in Suitland, Maryland, shall be known and designated as the "Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building".

SEC. 3. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 2 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 5599.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 5599 is a bill to designate the Federal building in Suitland, Maryland, as the Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building. The bill has bipartisan support.

Although Thomas Jefferson is best remembered as the third President of the United States, as the author of the Declaration of Independence, he also is considered by some to be the first director of the U.S. census.

In 1790, while Secretary of State, Jefferson conducted the first national census. Although the practice of performing a census has been in practice for thousands of years, the U.S. census is considered to be the first modern periodic census. Several European countries followed suit shortly after in the early 19th century.

Today, the results of the census are used to determine the size of congressional districts, the allocation of seats allotted to each State in the U.S. House of Representatives, as a factor in the allocation of Federal resources, and perhaps most importantly as a research tool to track economic and population trends in the United States.

It is most fitting and proper that we support this designation and honor one of Jefferson's numerous contributions to our Nation's history. I support H.R. 5599.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 5599 names the new Census Bureau headquarters building in Suitland, Maryland, as the Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building.

As the first Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson was a strong advocate of a national census, and he supervised the first census in 1790. Early population estimates misjudged the number of Americans in many areas, unfortunately, and it resulted in underrepresentation in many areas of this country in the first Congress. Under Jefferson's leadership, however, the census developed into a more useful and accurate process.

Thomas Jefferson's advocacy for a complete and accurate census laid the foundation for the Census Bureau we have today. He believed that an accurate census was essential to ensure that the government represented its people effectively. So it is fitting that the new census building bear his name, and I support the bill and urge its adoption and applaud my colleague, Representative MALONEY, on bringing it before the House for its adoption today.

But while we debate these matters, the issue persists, and that is the high cost of gasoline. And this Congress continues to ignore the rising cost of gasoline. American workers are struggling to fill up their tanks, and this Congress has done nothing to ease that burden. The Democratic majority has failed to provide the real leadership in addressing the high cost of fuel which requires an increased supply, American supply.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for an opportunity to speak on this.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding and for her leadership in this Congress, and I rise in strong support of my bill H.R. 5599, a bill to designate the Census Bureau headquarters Federal building for Founding Father Thomas Jefferson.

The Census Bureau has just been relocated to a modern state-of-the-art building in Suitland, Maryland. I want to thank Chairman OBERSTAR and Congresswoman HOLMES NORTON for their help in moving this bill forward.

I introduced this legislation along with colleagues that have been strong supporters of an accurate census—HOLMES NORTON, HOYER, DAVIS, TURNER, RUPPERSBERGER, HONDA, GONZALEZ, WYNN, COHEN, and CANNON—to honor Thomas Jefferson's contributions to the modern census and the Founding Fathers' vision of a truly representative government in which every American counts.

Jefferson's role in establishing a republic based on the principle of fair

representation emphasizes the historical significance of the American census and the way our government views and governs itself today. Jefferson's significant contributions to the early American census include his alerting the Nation to the importance of accuracy in census taking and his recognition of the need to fully represent newly acquired territories in the census.

Historically, census taking was a negative thing. It was used for raising taxes for the militia. Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State, oversaw the first census in history, which was positive, which gave the people more than it took away by empowering those counted with a voice in their government.

As we have heard in recent weeks, the 2010 census has some very serious challenges. Although much work remains to be done to ensure its successful implementation, naming this building for Thomas Jefferson underscores this Congress' commitment to getting it right and making sure that every citizen is counted.

□ 1130

A fair and accurate census, putting political power in the hands of the people, is a uniquely American invention. Let us honor our Founding Fathers' legacy by celebrating Thomas Jefferson, the father of the modern census.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5599, a bill to designate the Federal building located at 4600 Silver Hill Road in Suitland, Maryland, as the "Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building".

The United States census is a count of the Nation's population, conducted every 10 years. The results are used for various purposes, including allocation of congressional seats and impacting Government program funding for States and localities. The U.S. Census Bureau is responsible for conducting the census and serves "as the leading source of quality data about the Nation's people and economy," according to its mission.

The census is our Nation's longest continuous scientific project. In 1790, while Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson conducted the first official count of the Nation's population. Census Day was August 2, 1790. The national census has several colonial predecessors with eight of the original 13 colonies having conducted their own census.

President Jefferson not only was one of our Founding Fathers and the third President of the United States, but he was also an early demographer.

Therefore, it is fitting and proper that we designate this Federal building as the "Thomas Jefferson Census Bureau Headquarters Building".

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5599.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this resolution.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the passage of this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5599.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH CENTERS RENEWAL ACT OF 2008

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1343) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1343

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Health Centers Renewal Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HEALTH CENTERS PROGRAM.

Section 330(r)(1) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(r)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose of carrying out this section, in addition to the amounts authorized to be appropriated under subsection (d), there are authorized to be appropriated—

"(A) for fiscal year 2008, \$2,213,020,000;

"(B) for fiscal year 2009, \$2,451,394,400;

"(C) for fiscal year 2010, \$2,757,818,700;

"(D) for fiscal year 2011, \$3,116,335,131; and

"(E) for fiscal year 2012, \$3,537,040,374.".

SEC. 3. RECOGNITION OF HIGH POVERTY AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 330(c) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) RECOGNITION OF HIGH POVERTY AREAS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In making grants under this subsection, the Secretary may recognize the unique needs of high poverty areas.

"(B) HIGH POVERTY AREA DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'high poverty area' means a catchment area which is established in a manner that is consistent with the factors in subsection (k)(3)(J), and the poverty rate of which is greater than the national average poverty rate as determined by the Bureau of the Census.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to grants made on or after January 1, 2009.

SEC. 4. LIABILITY PROTECTIONS FOR HEALTH CENTER VOLUNTEER PRACTITIONERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 224 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(1)(A)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "or employee" and inserting "employee, or (subject to subsection (k)(4)) volunteer practitioner"; and

(B) in the second sentence, by inserting "and subsection (k)(4)" after "subject to paragraph (5)"; and

(2) in each of subsections (g), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m)—

(A) by striking the term "employee, or contractor" each place such term appears and inserting "employee, volunteer practitioner, or contractor";

(B) by striking the term "employee, and contractor" each place such term appears and inserting "employee, volunteer practitioner, and contractor";

(C) by striking the term "employee, or any contractor" each place such term appears and inserting "employee, volunteer practitioner, or contractor"; and

(D) by striking the term "employees, or contractors" each place such term appears and inserting "employees, volunteer practitioners, or contractors".

(b) APPLICABILITY; DEFINITION.—Section 224(k) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233(k)) is amended by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(4)(A) Subsections (g) through (m) apply with respect to volunteer practitioners beginning with the first fiscal year for which an appropriations Act provides that amounts in the fund under paragraph (2) are available with respect to such practitioners.

"(B) For purposes of subsections (g) through (m), the term 'volunteer practitioner' means a practitioner who, with respect to an entity described in subsection (g)(4), meets the following conditions:

"(i) In the State involved, the practitioner is a licensed physician, a licensed clinical psychologist, or other licensed or certified health care practitioner.

"(ii) At the request of such entity, the practitioner provides services to patients of the entity, at a site at which the entity operates or at a site designated by the entity. The weekly number of hours of services provided to the patients by the practitioner is not a factor with respect to meeting conditions under this subparagraph.

"(iii) The practitioner does not for the provision of such services receive any compensation from such patients, from the entity, or from third-party payors (including reimbursement under any insurance policy or health plan, or under any Federal or State health benefits program)."

SEC. 5. LIABILITY PROTECTIONS FOR HEALTH CENTER PRACTITIONERS PROVIDING SERVICES IN EMERGENCY AREAS.

Section 224(g) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 233(g)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(B)(ii), by striking "subparagraph (C)" and inserting "subparagraph (C) and paragraph (6)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following paragraph:

"(6)(A) Subject to subparagraph (C), paragraph (1)(B)(ii) applies to health services provided to individuals who are not patients of the entity involved if, as determined under criteria issued by the Secretary, the following conditions are met:

"(i) The services are provided by a contractor, volunteer practitioner (as defined in subsection (k)(4)(B)), or employee of the entity who is a physician or other licensed or certified health care practitioner and who is otherwise deemed to be an employee for purposes of paragraph (1)(A) when providing services with respect to the entity.

"(ii) The services are provided in an emergency area (as defined in subparagraph (D)), with respect to a public health emergency or major disaster described in subparagraph (D), and during the period for which such emergency or disaster is determined or declared, respectively.

"(iii) The services of the contractor, volunteer practitioner, or employee (referred to in this paragraph as the 'out-of-area practitioner') are provided under an arrangement with—

"(I) an entity that is deemed to be an employee for purposes of paragraph (1)(A) and that serves the emergency area involved (referred to in this paragraph as an 'emergency-area entity'); or

“(II) a Federal agency that has responsibilities regarding the provision of health services in such area during the emergency.

“(iv) The purposes of the arrangement are—

“(I) to coordinate, to the extent practicable, the provision of health services in the emergency area by the out-of-area practitioner with the provision of services by the emergency-area entity, or by the Federal agency, as the case may be;

“(II) to identify a location in the emergency area to which such practitioner should report for purposes of providing health services, and to identify an individual or individuals in the area to whom the practitioner should report for such purposes; and

“(III) to verify the identity of the practitioner and that the practitioner is licensed or certified by one or more of the States.

“(v) With respect to the licensure or certification of health care practitioners, the provision of services by the out-of-area practitioner in the emergency area is not a violation of the law of the State in which the area is located.

“(B) In issuing criteria under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall take into account the need to rapidly enter into arrangements under such subparagraph in order to provide health services in emergency areas promptly after the emergency begins.

“(C) Subparagraph (A) applies with respect to an act or omission of an out-of-area practitioner only to the extent that the practitioner is not immune from liability for such act or omission under the Volunteer Protection Act of 1997.

“(D) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘emergency area’ means a geographic area for which—

“(i) the Secretary has made a determination under section 319 that a public health emergency exists; or

“(ii) a presidential declaration of major disaster has been issued under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.”.

SEC. 6. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEMS TO EXPAND ACCESS TO PRIMARY AND PREVENTIVE SERVICES FOR THE MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED.

Part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 259b et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new subpart:

“Subpart XI—Demonstration Project for Integrated Health Systems to Expand Access to Primary and Preventive Services for the Medically Underserved

“SEC. 340H. DEMONSTRATION PROJECT FOR INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEMS TO EXPAND ACCESS TO PRIMARY AND PREVENTIVE CARE FOR THE MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 1, 2009, the Secretary shall establish a demonstration project (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘demonstration’) under which up to 30 qualifying integrated health systems receive grants for the costs of their operations to expand access to primary and preventive services for the medically underserved.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as authorizing grants to be made or used for the costs of specialty care or hospital care furnished by an integrated health system.

“(b) APPLICATION.—Any integrated health system desiring to participate in the demonstration shall submit an application in such manner, at such time, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) CRITERIA FOR SELECTION.—In selecting integrated health systems to participate in the demonstration (hereafter in this section referred to as ‘participating integrated health systems’), the Secretary shall ensure representation of integrated health systems that are located in a variety of States (including the District of Colum-

bia and the territories and possessions of the United States) and locations within States, including rural areas, inner-city areas, and frontier areas.

“(d) DURATION.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, the demonstration shall be conducted (and operating grants be made to each participating integrated health system) for a period of 3 years.

“(e) REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress interim and final reports with respect to the demonstration, with an interim report being submitted not later than 3 months after the demonstration has been in operation for 24 months and a final report being submitted not later than 3 months after the close of the demonstration.

“(2) CONTENT.—Such reports shall evaluate the effectiveness of the demonstration in providing greater access to primary and preventive care for medically underserved populations, and how the coordinated approach offered by integrated health systems contributes to improved patient outcomes.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$25,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011 to carry out this section.

“(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as requiring or authorizing a reduction in the amounts appropriated for grants to health centers under section 330 for the fiscal years referred to in paragraph (1).

“(g) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) FRONTIER AREA.—The term ‘frontier area’ has the meaning given to such term in regulations promulgated pursuant to section 330I(r).

“(2) INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEM.—The term ‘integrated health system’ means a health system that—

“(A) has a demonstrated capacity and commitment to provide a full range of primary care, specialty care, and hospital care in both inpatient and outpatient settings; and

“(B) is organized to provide such care in a coordinated fashion.

“(3) QUALIFYING INTEGRATED HEALTH SYSTEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualifying integrated health system’ means a public or private nonprofit entity that is an integrated health system that meets the requirements of subparagraph (B) and serves a medically underserved population (either through the staff and supporting resources of the integrated health system or through contracts or cooperative arrangements) by providing—

“(i) required primary and preventive health and related services (as defined in paragraph (4)); and

“(ii) as may be appropriate for a population served by a particular integrated health system, integrative health services (as defined in paragraph (5)) that are necessary for the adequate support of the required primary and preventive health and related services and that improve care coordination.

“(B) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this subparagraph are that the integrated health system—

“(i) will make the required primary and preventive health and related services of the integrated health system available and accessible in the service area of the integrated health system promptly, as appropriate, and in a manner which assures continuity;

“(ii) will demonstrate financial responsibility by the use of such accounting procedures and other requirements as may be prescribed by the Secretary;

“(iii) provides or will provide services to individuals who are eligible for medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act or for assistance under title XXI of such Act;

“(iv) has prepared a schedule of fees or payments for the provision of its services consistent with locally prevailing rates or charges and designed to cover its reasonable costs of operation and has prepared a corresponding schedule of discounts to be applied to the payment of such fees or payments, which discounts are adjusted on the basis of the patient’s ability to pay;

“(v) will assure that no patient will be denied health care services due to an individual’s inability to pay for such services;

“(vi) will assure that any fees or payments required by the system for such services will be reduced or waived to enable the system to fulfill the assurance described in clause (v);

“(vii) provides assurances that any grant funds will be expended to supplement, and not supplant, the expenditures of the integrated health system for primary and preventive health services for the medically underserved; and

“(viii) submits to the Secretary such reports as the Secretary may require to determine compliance with this subparagraph.

“(C) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ENTITIES.—The term ‘qualifying integrated health system’ may include a nurse-managed health clinic if such clinic meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) (except those requirements that have been waived under paragraph (4)(B)).

“(4) REQUIRED PRIMARY AND PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND RELATED SERVICES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘required primary and preventive health and related services’ means basic health services consisting of—

“(i) health services related to family medicine, internal medicine, pediatrics, obstetrics, or gynecology that are furnished by physicians where appropriate, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and nurse midwives;

“(ii) diagnostic laboratory services and radiologic services;

“(iii) preventive health services, including prenatal and perinatal care; appropriate cancer screening; well-child services; immunizations against vaccine-preventable diseases; screenings for elevated blood lead levels, communicable diseases, and cholesterol; pediatric eye, ear, and dental screenings to determine the need for vision and hearing correction and dental care; and voluntary family planning services;

“(iv) emergency medical services; and

“(v) pharmaceutical services, behavioral, mental health, and substance abuse services, preventive dental services, and recuperative care, as may be appropriate.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—In the case of an integrated health system serving a targeted population, the Secretary shall, upon a showing of good cause, waive the requirement that the integrated health system provide each required primary and preventive health and related service under this paragraph if the Secretary determines one or more such services are inappropriate or unnecessary for such population.

“(5) INTEGRATIVE HEALTH SERVICES.—The term ‘integrative health services’ means services that are not included as required primary and preventive health and related services and are associated with achieving the greater integration of a health care delivery system to improve patient care coordination so that the system either directly provides or ensures the provision of a broad range of culturally competent services. Integrative health services include but are not limited to the following:

“(A) Outreach activities.

“(B) Case management and patient navigation services.

“(C) Chronic care management.

“(D) Transportation to health care facilities.

“(E) Development of provider networks and other innovative models to engage local physicians and other providers to serve the medically underserved within a community.

“(F) Recruitment, training, and compensation of necessary personnel.

“(G) Acquisition of technology for the purpose of coordinating care.

“(H) Improvements to provider communication, including implementation of shared information systems or shared clinical systems.

“(I) Determination of eligibility for Federal, State, and local programs that provide, or financially support the provision of, medical, social, housing, educational, or other related services.

“(J) Development of prevention and disease management tools and processes.

“(K) Translation services.

“(L) Development and implementation of evaluation measures and processes to assess patient outcomes.

“(M) Integration of primary care and mental health services.

“(N) Carrying out other activities that may be appropriate to a community and that would increase access by the uninsured to health care, such as access initiatives for which private entities provide non-Federal contributions to supplement the Federal funds provided through the grants for the initiatives.

“(6) SPECIALTY CARE.—The term ‘specialty care’ means care that is provided through a referral and by a physician or nonphysician practitioner, such as surgical consultative services, radiology services requiring the immediate presence of a physician, audiology, optometric services, cardiology services, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) services, computerized axial tomography (CAT) scans, nuclear medicine studies, and ambulatory surgical services.

“(7) NURSE-MANAGED HEALTH CLINIC.—The term ‘nurse-managed health clinic’ means a nurse-practice arrangement, managed by advanced practice nurses, that provides care for underserved and vulnerable populations and is associated with a school, college, or department of nursing or an independent nonprofit health or social services agency.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1343, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2008.

The health centers program was first enacted 40 years ago. Today, health centers are located in 6,000 sites in all 50 States serving as the medical home and family physician to 17 million people nationally.

Over the years, the health centers program has gained tremendous support from Democrats, Republicans, the Congress and the President. We don't all agree on much, but there is no doubt that the health centers program has been a great success.

The overwhelming support for the health centers program may be attributed to the impact health centers have made on the health and well-being of

our country's most vulnerable populations.

Federally qualified health centers are local, nonprofit or public entity, community-owned health care provider serving low-income and medically underserved areas as designated by the Federal Government.

Health centers provide comprehensive primary and preventive health care, with services available to all community residents where they are located, regardless of the patients' ability to pay.

Community health centers have helped fill the medical void for low-income communities and uninsured individuals.

The health centers program's focus on primary and preventive care has garnered savings for our health care system because the health centers provide the uninsured and underserved with access to care they would usually receive at hospital emergency rooms.

By providing access to affordable primary care, health centers have also reduced the need for in-patient and specialty care in hospitals, because medical problems in health center patients are treated earlier, before they require in-patient hospital care.

Studies suggest that health centers save Medicaid approximately 30 percent in annual spending for health centers due to reduced specialty care referrals, fewer hospital admissions, and emergency room visits.

Forty percent of health center patients are uninsured, and 35 percent depend on Medicaid, making health centers a critical feature of our country's safety net and, for many individuals, their only source for health care services.

Unfortunately, the number of uninsured in our country is 47 million and has been steadily rising, and in turn, the need for health centers are increasing.

Our district in Texas and many other communities nationwide are desperately in need of more health centers. Houston has approximately 1 million uninsured but only 10 federally qualified health centers.

As the fourth largest city in the United States, Houston lags far behind the number of health centers located in our area when compared to Chicago, with over 80 community health centers and the third largest city in the country.

Houston is not alone in this need for more health centers. Studies show that 56 million Americans lack access to primary care or a health care home.

The Health Centers Renewal Act will reauthorize the health centers program, which would address the growing need for community health centers in not only my area but throughout the United States.

This legislation would authorize the increased funding necessary for our community to build on the success of the health centers program and develop additional health centers to meet our

tremendous need for affordable and quality health care.

This bill would allow health centers to serve approximately 23 million patients in the next 5 years.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. PICKERING, who is the original cosponsor, along with the Energy and Commerce Committee and my subcommittee for their full support of this legislation.

I believe the bill is truly an investment in the future of health centers for the medically underserved communities throughout our country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1343, the Health Centers Renewal Act. I have been a long time supporter of the community health centers program because health centers provide quality health care services to people and communities which might not otherwise have access to such care.

Last Congress, I sponsored a 5-year health centers reauthorization measure which passed the House by large margins. But unfortunately, we were unable to finalize the legislation and see it signed into law.

I would like to thank Mr. GREEN for his leadership on the legislation this year and for the willingness of our subcommittee chairman, Mr. PALLONE, and our full committee chairman, Mr. DINGELL, who worked in a bipartisan way to improve this reauthorization measure.

We made important reforms to the program to encourage the participation of volunteer physicians at health centers. It is my understanding that many physicians would be more willing to volunteer their time at a health center if they knew they would have liability protection from frivolous lawsuits. This bill provides that assurance through the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Through our work in the committee, we also addressed a situation which developed following Hurricanes Katrina and Rita where some health center employees were not able to carry their liability protection out of their home facility to go work on the gulf coast. We made a common-sense change to address this situation to ensure that health centers can meet their staffing needs during times of emergency. This amendment mirrored the legislation introduced by the late Representative Paul Gilmore, and I am glad that we can honor him by including this in this measure.

Community health centers are an important component of our health care safety net. While many communities across the country enjoy the benefits of having a health center, there are still many areas which could benefit from continued expansion of the program.

I would urge my colleagues to support this measure and give medically underserved communities across this country greater access to health care

providers at a local community health center.

Madam Speaker, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, we will reserve the balance of our time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to yield to one of the members of our Health Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce and a gentleman whose language has been incorporated into this bill, Mr. TIM MURPHY, for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member DEAL and I thank Mr. GREEN for this very, very important bill, this Health Centers Renewal Act to provide some very, very important coverage for some of our most needy citizens.

You know, when people oftentimes will comment upon how many people in America don't have health care, who recognize that actually many of them are covered by programs such as Medicaid, they may or may not know it, or SCHIP or some choose not to have health insurance. But there are also those millions of Americans who simply are not low-income enough for Medicaid. They don't have children, so they're not covered by SCHIP. And they're not old enough for Medicare. Where do they go?

Well, community health centers provide the very health care that they need, give them health care home, give them peace of mind. It is a place where, for a low fee, they can have ongoing health care, know that they have a doctor who knows them, and dentist and psychologist and other ones who provide the vital care for them, and it keeps costs down. Keeps costs down tremendously.

I believe some 30 percent of people who go to community health centers do not have health care insurance, and of those who do attend, it maintains even lower costs for Medicaid patients. So it is savings at all levels.

But unfortunately, there are huge vacancies with community health centers. Those vacancies have to do with normal family physicians or psychiatrists or OB/GYNs, and that has led to backups. That has led to delays in appointments. And the question is, is there a way we can resolve that?

Well, here's something we discovered that was odd, and this bill corrects that. Strangely enough, if physicians want to volunteer at a free clinic, they can do so, and they're covered by the Federal Tort Claims Act. On the other hand, if they are paid medical staff at a free clinic, they're not covered under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Reverse that for a community health center. If they're paid staff at a community health center, they're covered under the Federal Tort Claims Act, but if they want to volunteer, they are not.

I introduced a bill, H.R. 1626, the Family Healthcare Accessibility Act, a couple of years ago to correct that, and I am pleased that Mr. GREEN has put

this into this bill. That basically provides that physicians and other health professionals, nurse practitioners who want to volunteer are covered.

What does this mean? That means lower costs for clinics, and that means that physicians, for example, who may want to give some of their time each week or each month, a clinic will be there with welcome arms. It has not been something that's been allowed before, but it does provide lower health care costs. It is a way for physicians and other primary practitioners to be able to give back to the community. It is a way to lower health care costs.

In this Nation, where there are 760 primary care physician openings, 290 nurse practitioners openings and 310 dentist openings just a couple of years ago—and those numbers may have climbed—this provides a way that we can fulfill those needs at basically no cost.

I thank the chairman, I thank Ranking Member DEAL and everybody else who has been part of this bill in making this a working bill to help bring health care costs down, help bring health care to America's needy citizens and help bring a health care home for so many Americans.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, we will continue to reserve. We have no other speakers.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I would yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), a member of the committee who has also worked on this legislation.

Mr. TERRY. Thank you, and I, too, rise in support of our community health centers and the reauthorization.

We have two in my district in Omaha. We have the One World Health Center. It used to be known as the Chicano Awareness Center, but now it has kind of created a new name and new marketing in the sense that it really helps all of our community, and then in the north Omaha community we have the Charles Drew Center.

I frequent these facilities, meeting with their physicians who work there and their directors, and every time I have been impressed with the high quality of the health care that they provide for our communities. They are first-rate. Both of them are in brand new buildings that can rival any physicians' offices anywhere else in the metropolitan Omaha community.

And I think these health centers really are key in our try to provide universal health care or at least access for everybody so those that have minimal insurance or no insurance can show up at our community health centers and receive first-class medical care. And that is one of the major reasons why I stand in support.

Now, just quickly here, I feel compelled from listening to some of the testimony from a previous bill, we had a speaker that stood up and talked about how it was the White House or George Bush's fault that we have to import more oil during his administration.

□ 1145

And of course that does appear to be our energy policy. But keep in mind that this House has voted, in the 10 years I've been here, at least I think eight or nine times to open up either offshore or Alaska oil, which has been shut down on every attempt. We've been able to pass it a handful of times; it has either been vetoed or blocked within the Senate.

So if you aren't allowed to use American supply of energy, of course the only alternative is to import more. I'm personally embarrassed that our administration is going to the Middle East and begging for them to increase production. What that shows, to me, is they're giving up on the fact that we should be using more of our own American resources. And we can do that. We should open up offshore. We should open Alaska. We should open up the oil shale in Colorado.

Now, what the public should know is, just in the last 6 months, back in November-December, this House voted to take the oil shale in Colorado and Wyoming off limits to oil companies to be able to extract oil from there. We made it so you cannot extract that oil.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TERRY. Just 2 weeks ago, this House voted to ban the military from using synthetic aviation fuel made from coal, also known as coal-to-liquid. So here's another alternative energy source that we could use to provide aviation fuel not only to the military, but to the civilian side, that would be stable, reliable, no cost fluctuations like you see because of the oil markets. But yet this House voted 2 weeks ago to say no to using that source for fuel. So of course if we're going to limit every source of energy in this country, you have no other place to go.

Last week, I rolled out a plan at home that showed if we allowed all of our resources to be used from the conservation from new vehicles and tax credits to help consumers purchase them, we open up offshore oil shale in Alaska, as well as the alternative, we can become energy independent.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, as much as I would like to debate energy prices, hopefully we can deal with renewal of qualified health centers.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlelady from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Health Centers Renewal Act.

As important as this bill is to local communities, I believe the first thing we should be dealing with is gas prices and the devastating effect it's having on American families. Unfortunately, the majority refuses to deal with this issue.

Our Nation has over 1,000 community health centers which provide high-quality, affordable primary health care to more than 16 million Americans in over 6,000 communities nationwide.

I come from Fort Worth, Texas and was mayor there before I came to Congress. When I was mayor, we didn't have a community health center in Fort Worth. And I quickly realized the need for one because of the huge concentration of people we had who weren't able to access health care except for emergency centers.

When I came to Congress, I sat on the committee that funds health centers and worked to get a community health center in Fort Worth. We now have the Albert Galvan Health Clinic in Fort Worth, which serves a terrific need.

Parents who take their children to the center have developed a relationship with a primary care physician who can track families and their needs. They're also receiving good preventative care, which is taking away the need to visit an emergency room.

In Texas, community health centers are helping ease the burden tremendously on hospitals and local providers across the State, with 10 percent of low-income, uninsured Texans now relying on community health centers for their primary care. Texas health centers are caring for over 700,000 patients.

Nationally they're having a strong impact as well. A 2006 study by the National Association of Community Health Centers shows the number of patients treated by health centers increased by 46 percent between 1999 and 2004.

Overall, it's estimated community health centers care for over 17 million underserved people in rural and urban areas across the country. However, there is still a great need for more community health centers. Too many families have to drive long distances to reach a health center, and with gas prices at an all-time high, many families can't afford the drive to the doctor.

Thirty-six million people—one in eight Americans—don't have a doctor or regular source of care. If these 36 million Americans did have a regular source of care at a community health center, billions of dollars in health care costs could be saved from reduced ER visits.

There is evidence that people who get most of their primary care from a health center have 41 percent lower overall health care costs than the others who don't, saving Federal dollars of \$10 to \$17 billion in 2007 alone.

Health care centers are considered one of the most effective government programs in the country and have a solid record of keeping communities healthy and disease free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. I would yield the gentlelady 1 additional minute.

Ms. GRANGER. Because community health care centers provide families

and the community with a health care safety net they can rely on and also ease the burden of our entire system, they're becoming increasingly important to meeting a national demand. Health care should be affordable, accessible and convenient so that individuals and families can access care when they're sick and get the care they need.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1343.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I'm a medical doctor. As a physician, I have been a medical director in a National Health Service Corps community health clinic. I have given away hundreds of thousands of dollars of my services to the poor over my 30-some-odd years' career of practicing medicine in rural southwest Georgia, as well as in northeast Georgia where I currently live.

Health care costs are issues that particularly poor people have a tremendous difficulty dealing with. And it certainly is a very important issue. We've got to solve the crisis we have in health care financing today. We don't have a health care quality problem, we have a health care financing problem. And a lot of this is due to an overregulation on the health care system, on doctors, hospitals, pharmaceutical companies, and other entities.

But an issue that actually affects poor people more than health care today is the tremendous cost of energy. Right now today, we're drilling for ice on the ground in Mars, and we can't even drill for oil in America. It's got to stop. We've got to bring down the cost of gasoline. And we can do that. We can do that by drilling offshore. We can do that by tapping into the oil sources we have throughout the west and in Alaska. And it's absolutely critical.

The cost of gasoline is hurting everyone. It's driving up the cost of groceries in the supermarket. It's driving up the cost of all goods and services, including health care. So if we're going to lower the cost of the health care, if we're going to lower the cost of food in the grocery store, we've got to lower the cost of gasoline by drilling now and streamlining the permitting process to get refineries so that they're producing more gasoline and we can bring the cost down. So I encourage my colleagues to push for drilling for oil now.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I believe the majority is ready to close, and I will close at this point if he has no other speakers.

I believe that the importance of community health centers has certainly been underscored in a bipartisan fashion by the discussion we've had here on this floor. I would remind us all that this is an initiative that President Bush inaugurated several years ago when his goal was to expand the number of community health centers across this country, ultimately so that every county in this country would be served

from one of these facilities. Certainly all of us recognize it is one of the better ways that we have available to us to be able to provide needed health care to communities that are underserved at the current time.

Once again, in closing, I would commend Mr. GREEN for his willingness to work in a bipartisan fashion on this reauthorization legislation. I believe that the amendments that were added to it before its reaching the floor today have considerably improved this bill. In particular, it now will allow physicians who are either retired or who want to volunteer a portion of their time to assist in one of these community health centers the ability to do so with some degree of limited liability protection. I think that will increase the number of physicians who are available in these facilities, and by doing that, it will increase the quality of care to those who are receiving services in community health centers.

With that, I would encourage passage of this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to close. We have no other speakers.

First, to comment on my colleague from Georgia. Coming from Houston, Texas, I have some pipeline companies that would love to have that contract from Mars to Houston to bring oil if we discover it drilling through that ice there.

I appreciate, as a physician, your devotion to community-based health clinics, because that's what this bill is about, it's about reauthorizing. In fact, as we stand here today, Madam Speaker, we're actually expanding one in our district. Like I said earlier, we only have 10 in the Houston area, and our next largest city close to us has 80. So we have a job to do in Houston, in Texas—and my colleague from Fort Worth mentioned it—to expand community-based health centers. This bill will allow us to do that because it will go to the underserved community, areas in the country that really don't even have access to a community-based health center now and will have with this legislation, also with the additional authorization funds.

Of course we have to go back and ask the Appropriations Committee every year for additional funding that we authorize. But that's something that we do. This is very bipartisan support for community-based health centers. That's why I would hope that we would have almost unanimous support for this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I enthusiastically rise today in support of H.R. 1343, The Health Centers Renewal Act of 2007. For over 40 years, community health centers have provided cost-effective, high-quality health care to poor and medically underserved people in the States, the District of Columbia, and the territories, including the working poor, the uninsured, and many high-risk and vulnerable populations. Community

Health Centers nationwide provide care to 1 of every 8 uninsured Americans, 1 of every 4 Americans in poverty, and 1 of every 9 rural Americans.

As a former president of the National Community Health Centers organization, I am honored to advocate for the expansion of this tremendously vital segment of our comprehensive healthcare system. By incorporating both H.R. 5544—The Patients and Public Health Partnership Act of 2008 and H.R. 870, which amends the Public Health Service Act to provide liability protections for practitioners of health centers who provide health services in emergency areas into this legislation; H.R. 1343 is now expanded to increase both insured coverage and access to critical resources for these invaluable medical professionals. This legislation empowers community health practitioners to serve on a larger scale and make an even greater positive impact particularly at a time when our health care delivery systems across the board are overburdened. I ask my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 1343.

Mr. McHUGH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1343, the Health Centers Renewal Act of 2007. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, which would reauthorize the community health centers program through fiscal year 2012.

Community health centers are an integral component of our Nation's health care infrastructure. Nationwide, more than 1,500 such centers provide high-quality, cost-effective primary health care to anyone seeking care. In New York State, health centers provide services to 1.1 million people who receive care at over 425 sites.

Of note, community health center fees are based on income and family size and services are provided regardless of insurance status or ability to pay. Forty-three percent of New York State health center patients are Medicaid beneficiaries and 28 percent are uninsured. Moreover, over 86 percent of New York State health center patients have incomes at or below 200 percent of the Federal poverty level, which in 2008 is \$42,400 for a family of four.

Access to health care is truly one of the most difficult challenges for Americans living in rural areas like northern and central New York. Community health centers have been a tremendous help in our efforts to improve access to health care. I am thankful that my constituents in New York State's 23rd Congressional District are served by four community health centers: Hudson Headwaters Health Network; Northern Oswego County Health Services; The Smith House; and the United Cerebral Palsy Association of the North Country.

I deeply appreciate the dedication and hard work of the staff at those health centers. Indeed, I am hesitant to imagine a scenario in which my constituents did not have the benefit of their excellent services. I also appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GREEN, and the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. PICKERING, to develop this measure and bring it to the House floor today; I look forward to its enactment.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1343, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

POISON CENTER SUPPORT, ENHANCEMENT, AND AWARENESS ACT OF 2008

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5669) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program to provide assistance for poison prevention, sustain the funding of poison centers, and enhance the public health of people of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5669

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Poison Center Support, Enhancement, and Awareness Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Poison centers are the primary defense of the United States against injury and deaths from poisoning. Twenty-four hours a day, the general public as well as health care practitioners contact their local poison centers for help in diagnosing and treating victims of poisoning. In 2007, more than 4 million calls were managed by poison centers providing ready and direct access for all people of the United States, including many underserved populations in the United States, with vital emergency public health information and response.

(2) Poisoning is the second most common form of unintentional death in the United States. In any given year, there will be between 3 million and 5 million poison exposures. Sixty percent of these exposures will involve children under the age of 6 who are exposed to toxins in their home. Poisoning accounts for 285,000 hospitalizations, 1.2 million days of acute hospital care, and more than 26,000 fatalities in 2005.

(3) In 2008, the Harvard Injury Control Research Center reported that poisonings from accidents and unknown circumstances more than tripled in rate since 1990. In 2005, the last year for which data are available, 26,858 people died from accidental or unknown poisonings. This represents an increase of 20,000 since 1990 and an increase of 2,400 between 2004 and 2005. Fatalities from poisoning are increasing in the United States in near epidemic proportions. The funding of programs to reverse this trend is needed now more than ever.

(4) In 2004, The Institute of Medicine, of the National Academies recommended that the

"Congress should amend the current Poison Control Center Enhancement and Awareness Act Amendments of 2003 to provide sufficient funding to support the proposed Poison Prevention and Control System with its national network of poison centers. Support for the core activities at the current level of service is estimated to require more than \$100 million annually."

(5) Sustaining the funding structure and increasing accessibility to poison control centers will promote the utilization of poison control centers and reduce the inappropriate use of emergency medical services and other more costly health care services. The 2004 Institute of Medicine Report to Congress determined that for every \$1 invested in the Nation's poison centers \$7 of health care costs are saved. In 2005, direct Federal health care program savings totaled in excess of \$525 million as the result of poison center public health services.

(6) More than 30 percent of the cost savings and financial benefits of the Nation's network of poison centers are realized annually by Federal health care programs (estimated to be more than \$1 billion), yet Federal funding support (as demonstrated by the annual authorization of \$30.1 million in Public Law 108-194) comprises less than 11 percent of the annual network expenditures of poison centers.

(7) Real-time data collected from the Nation's certified poison centers can be an important source of information for the detection, monitoring, and response for contamination of the air, water, pharmaceutical, or food supply.

(8) In the event of a terrorist event, poison centers will be relied upon as a critical source for accurate medical information and public health emergency response concerning the treatment of patients who have had an exposure to a chemical, radiological, or biological agent.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF POISON CENTERS NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

Section 1271 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-71) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1271. MAINTENANCE OF THE NATIONAL TOLL-FREE NUMBER.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide coordination and assistance to poison centers for the establishment of a nationwide toll-free phone number, and the maintenance of such number, to be used to access such centers.

"(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to carry out this section; and \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014 for the maintenance of the nationwide toll-free phone number under subsection (a)."

SEC. 4. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIONWIDE MEDIA CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CENTER UTILIZATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1272 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-72) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1272. NATIONWIDE MEDIA CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE POISON CENTER UTILIZATION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall carry out, and expand upon, a national media campaign to educate the public and health care providers about poison prevention and the availability of poison center resources in local communities and to conduct advertising campaigns concerning the nationwide toll-free number established under section 1271(a).

"(b) CONTRACT WITH ENTITY.—The Secretary may carry out subsection (a) by entering into contracts with a nationally recognized organization in the field of poison

control for the development and implementation of a nationwide poison prevention and poison center awareness campaign, which may include the development and distribution of poison prevention and poison center awareness materials; television, radio, Internet, and newspaper public service announcements; and other means of public and professional awareness and education.

“(c) EVALUATION.—The Secretary shall—

“(1) establish baseline measures and benchmarks to quantitatively evaluate the impact of the nationwide media campaign carried out under this section; and

“(2) prepare and submit to the appropriate congressional committees an evaluation of the nationwide media campaign on an annual basis.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$600,000 for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005, such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2006 through 2009, and \$1,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall be effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to contracts entered into on or after January 1, 2009.

SEC. 5. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE POISON CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1273 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300d-73) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 1273. MAINTENANCE OF THE POISON CENTER GRANT PROGRAM.

“(a) AUTHORIZATION OF GRANT PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall award grants to poison centers certified under subsection (c) (or granted a waiver under subsection (d)) and professional organizations in the field of poison control for the purposes of preventing, and providing treatment recommendations for, poisonings and complying with the operational requirements needed to sustain the certification of the center under subsection (c).

“(b) ADDITIONAL USES OF GRANT FUNDS.—In addition to the purposes described in subsection (a), a poison center or professional organization awarded a grant under such subsection may also use such grant for the following purposes:

“(1) To establish and evaluate best practices in the United States for poison prevention, poison center outreach, and emergency and preparedness programs.

“(2) To research, develop, implement, revise, and communicate standard patient management guidelines for commonly encountered toxic exposures.

“(3) To improve national toxic exposure surveillance by enhancing cooperative activities between poison centers in the United States and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

“(4) To develop, support, and enhance technology and capabilities of professional organizations in the field of poison control to collect national poisoning, toxic occurrence, and related public health data.

“(5) To develop initiatives to foster the enhanced public health utilization of national poison data collected by organizations described in paragraph (4).

“(6) To support and expand the toxicologic expertise within poison centers.

“(7) To improve the capacity of poison centers to answer high volumes of calls and respond during times of national crisis or other public health emergencies.

“(c) CERTIFICATION.—Except as provided under subsection (d), the Secretary may make a grant to a poison center under subsection (a) only if—

“(1) the center has been certified by a professional organization in the field of poison

control, and the Secretary has approved the organization as having in effect standards for certification that reasonably provide for the protection of the public health with respect to poisoning; or

“(2) the center has been certified by a State government, and the Secretary has approved the State government as having in effect standards for certification that reasonably provide for the protection of the public health with respect to poisoning.

“(d) WAIVER OF CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may grant a waiver of the certification requirement of subsection (c) with respect to a noncertified poison center that applies for a grant under this section if such center can reasonably demonstrate that the center will obtain such a certification within a reasonable period of time as determined appropriate by the Secretary.

“(2) RENEWAL.—The Secretary may renew a waiver under paragraph (1).

“(3) LIMITATION.—In no instance may the sum of the number of years for a waiver under paragraph (1) and a renewal under paragraph (2) exceed 5 years. The preceding sentence shall take effect as of the date of the enactment of the Poison Center Support, Enhancement, and Awareness Act of 2008.

“(e) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available to a poison center under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, or local funds provided for such center.

“(f) MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.—A poison center, in utilizing the proceeds of a grant under this section, shall maintain the expenditures of the center for activities of the center at a level that is not less than the level of expenditures maintained by the center for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the grant is received.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section—

“(1) for each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004, \$25,000,000;

“(2) for each of the fiscal years 2005 through 2009, \$27,500,000; and

“(3) for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2014, \$35,000,000, of which \$1,500,000 shall be used to award grants for the purpose described in subsection (b)(4).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall be effective as of the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to grants made on or after January 1, 2009.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5669, the Poison Control Center Enhancement and Awareness Act, a

bill that would provide assistance for poison prevention, sustain the funding of poison centers, and enhance the public health of people in the United States.

Unfortunately, poisoning is a significant problem, and according to Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ranks second only to motor vehicle crashes as a cause of unintentional injury or death. The economic cost of unintentional poisoning is considerable, as poisonings led to \$26 billion in medical expenses.

The bill before us today would reauthorize a poison center national toll free number, a national media campaign to promote the use of poison centers, and a grant program to provide assistance for poison prevention to ensure that unintentional poisonings do not lead to unintentional injuries or death.

I acknowledge my colleague, Congressman EDOLPHUS TOWNS, and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of this laudable legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the Speaker and Mr. GREEN and the committee for bringing this forward in such a timely manner.

This is an important act. This bill reflects a bipartisan effort, strengthened by the leadership of Mr. TOWNS, who provides the necessary funding for the poison control centers to continue their lifesaving work. I must say that in writing this bill, I enjoyed working with Mr. TOWNS and his staff and appreciate all of their help and cooperation.

The poison control center located in Omaha is the designated poison control center for Nebraska, Wyoming, and, amazingly, American Samoa and the Federated States of Micronesia. It is one of the oldest poison control centers in the United States, established in 1957. It's one of fifty-two poison control centers in the United States certified as a regional poison control center by the American Association of Poison Control Centers and operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week with full information and treatment capabilities. The majority of funding is provided by the Nebraska Med Center, Creighton University Medical Center, and the University of Nebraska.

In 2007, 61 poison control centers located throughout the United States played a critical role in saving lives by responding to 4 million calls. Poison control centers are staffed by medical professionals 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. These professionals are trained with the knowledge needed to assess poison risk, advise treatment and/or triage patients, recommend a treatment, or refer them to appropriate medical facilities.

Poisoning is the second leading form of unintentional death in the United States, and an estimated 60 percent of those exposures are experienced by children under the age of 6. Calls received by poison control centers addressed chemical, biological, and nuclear exposure, as well as adverse reactions to pesticides, cleaning products, and other hazardous products.

This bill provides the funding needed to authorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and the State grant program to provide assistance for poison prevention. This legislation not only saves lives but saves millions of dollars a year in preventable medical expenses. A report by the Institute of Medicine concludes that the Nation's poison control centers yielded \$7 in savings for every \$1 invested. In 2005 alone, poison control centers saved Federal health programs an estimated \$525 million.

I encourage my colleagues to examine this bill and join us in support of this bill and the lifesaving work of poison control centers across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

As I mentioned in my first statement, my opening statement, this is a bipartisan effort. Once again, I want to thank Mr. TOWNS.

I have the floor statement of our ranking member, JOE BARTON, who is also in support of this bill, and I will read in significant part his statement.

He states: "As our primary defense against injury and death from poisoning, poison control centers are a vital part of our health care system in the United States. Few people realize poisoning is the second most common form of unintentional death in the United States. In 2005 there were over 26,000 deaths in the United States caused by the ingestion of poisons that resulted from approximately 5 million incidents of poison exposure. And without question, the number of deaths and debilitating injuries resulting from poisoning would be significantly higher if it weren't for the strong network of poison centers we already have, and with the passage of the legislation before us today, I am confident that we can make a great program even better."

And thanks to all of the efforts from the members of the Energy and Commerce Committee in making this a great bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank my colleague, who is also a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, not only on

this bill but on other health care bills that we're dealing with on a bipartisan basis.

This reauthorization of the poison center national toll-free number and the media campaign has been a proven success. And since all politics is local, and since you mentioned the University of Nebraska, I have to mention the University of Texas Medical Branch that serves as our poison control publicity and facility, and it's very successful. We just need to expand it because we still are having deaths from poisoning, and we need to make sure that toll-free number is utilized and that information is out there for our community.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5669. The Poison control centers provide vital healthcare services to Americans of all incomes and keep costs from emergency procedures under control. Through their cost-saving programs, these centers benefit the general public, the government, health care providers, public health entities, and insurers.

In my district, Jay Schauben supervises a poison control center at Shans-Jacksonville hospital that treats a population of approximately six million. The Florida legislature created this center in 1989 to address overwhelming needs in the areas of exposure treatment and education, and Dr. Schauben's team has risen to the challenge and helped a countless number of my constituents. I would also like to thank Senator David Karnes, whose tireless support has been a great help in attaining funding for these important centers. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Gerold Schiebler of the University of Florida. Dr. Schiebler has been active for decades in the campaign for affordable healthcare and widespread access to poison control services.

With our economy in recession, now is certainly no time to further limit access to the quality healthcare services, or to tie the hands of advocates like Dr. Schauben, Senator Karnes, and Dr. Schiebler. So, it is critically important that poison control centers are reauthorized, and that these centers receive full funding through Fiscal Year 2014.

A wide variety of Americans benefit from the services poison control centers provide every day. The general public benefits by receiving cost-free poisoning prevention guidelines, emergency medical advice, and follow-up calls about treatment. These services prevent trips to emergency rooms and keep already outrageous healthcare costs from rising even further.

I represent one of the poorest districts in the State of Florida, and I have seen first hand the challenges my constituents face in finding affordable healthcare. A study group consisting of medical and poison control experts has found that every dollar spent on poison centers saves seven dollars in healthcare costs.

Also, poison control centers provide educational programs aimed at prevention. These programs help educate many uninsured Americans about means of poison prevention, and keep healthcare costs in the U.S. down by avoiding emergency room procedures.

In addition to saving low- and middle-income Americans healthcare dollars, poison control centers provide 24-hour emergency and informational services via a Toll-Free Na-

tional Hotline. This hotline is a vital source of information for many of my constituents, and Americans across the country, who could not otherwise receive medical advice or attention. This hotline also provides essential follow-up calls regarding continuing care of poison exposures.

Without a national hotline, many individuals with known or suspected toxic exposures would seek significantly more costly and less accessible healthcare alternatives, such as an emergency room visit.

Simply, the benefits of these centers are widespread, but are especially helpful to those whose incomes prohibit access to private health care services. Failure to reauthorize these important centers would represent a tremendous disservice to Americans in all Congressional districts.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5669.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5669, the "Poison Center Support, Enhancement, and Awareness Act of 2008." I would like to thank my friend from New York, Mr. TOWNS, and, my friend from Nebraska, Mr. TERRY, for introducing this important legislation, and I want to thank Chairman DINGELL and Subcommittee Chairman PALLONE for working in a bipartisan manner as we moved this bill through the Energy and Commerce Committee.

As our primary defense against injury and death from poisoning, poison centers are a vital part of our healthcare system in the United States. Few people realize that poisoning is the second most common form of unintentional death in the United States. In 2005, there were over 26,000 deaths in the United States caused by the ingestion of poisons that resulted from approximately 5 million incidents of poison exposure. And without question, the number of deaths and debilitating injuries resulting from poisoning would be significantly higher if it weren't for the strong network of poison centers we already have, and with passage of the legislation before us today, I am confident that we can make a great program even better.

Again, I thank my colleagues for their efforts on this bipartisan bill.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5669, the Poison Center Support, Enhancement, and Awareness Act of 2008, and I thank the bill's sponsor, Congressman TOWNS, for his leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman PALLONE and Chairman DINGELL for working to bring this bill before us today.

The poison control centers program has proven to be a very successful program for communities across the country, by providing a national toll-free number for poison emergencies, a national media campaign to promote the use of poison centers, and a poison prevention grant program.

In my district alone, the Illinois Poison Center handled 7,021 cases last year. Statewide, 51 percent of the calls the Illinois Poison Center handled involved children under the age of 5. I just can't imagine what families would do without this tremendous resource. Surely, this legislation which will reauthorize this program through 2014 and increase its total authorization to \$37.5 million annually will be money well spent.

Not only do poison centers save lives, they save time and resources by cost avoidance for patients who are cared for in their homes as

opposed to visiting a hospital and by reducing lengths of stay for patients who are cared for by a poison control center prior to arriving at a hospital.

Again, I thank the bill's sponsor and our Chairmen for their work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to give H.R. 5669 their support.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5669.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SOUND RECORDING AND FILM PRESERVATION PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5893) to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5893

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. SOUND RECORDING PRESERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION BOARD.—

(1) REAUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 133 of the National Recording Preservation Act of 2000 (2 U.S.C. 1743) is amended by striking "for each of the first 7 fiscal years beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act" and inserting "for the first fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2016".

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the National Recording Preservation Act of 2000.

(2) CRITERIA FOR REMOVAL OF MEMBERS.—Section 122(d)(2) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 1722(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) REMOVAL OF MEMBERS.—The Librarian shall have the authority to remove any member of the Board if the member fails, after receiving proper notification, to attend (or send a designated alternate to attend) a regularly scheduled Board meeting, or if the

member is determined by the Librarian to have substantially failed to fulfill the member's responsibilities as a member of the Board."

(b) NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION FOUNDATION.—

(1) REAUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 152411(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking "for each of the first 7 fiscal years beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this chapter" and inserting "for the first fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this chapter and each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2016".

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the National Recording Preservation Act of 2000.

(2) PERMITTING BOARD MEMBERS TO SERVE MORE THAN 2 TERMS.—Section 152403(b)(4) of such title is amended by striking the second sentence.

(3) PERMITTING BOARD TO DETERMINE LOCATION OF PRINCIPAL OFFICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 152406 of such title is amended by striking "District of Columbia" and inserting "District of Columbia or another place as determined by the Board of Directors".

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 152405(b) of such title is amended by striking "District of Columbia," and inserting "jurisdiction in which the principal office of the corporation is located,".

(4) CLARIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Section 152411(b) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(b) LIMITATION RELATED TO ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Amounts authorized under this section may not be used by the corporation for management and general or fundraising expenses as reported to the Internal Revenue Service as part of an annual information return required under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986."

SEC. 3. FILM PRESERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL FILM PRESERVATION BOARD.—

(1) REAUTHORIZATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 112 of the National Film Preservation Act of 1996 (2 U.S.C. 179v) is amended by inserting after "the Librarian" the following: "for the first fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and each succeeding fiscal year through fiscal year 2016".

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 113 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 179w) is amended by striking the first sentence.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the National Film Preservation Act of 1996.

(2) EXPANDING AUTHORIZED USES OF SEAL.—Section 103(b) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 179m(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Librarian may authorize the use of the seal by the Library or by others for other limited purposes in order to promote in the National Film Registry when exhibiting, showing, or otherwise disseminating films in the Registry."

(3) UPDATING NAMES OF ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED ON BOARD.—Section 104(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 179n(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (E), by striking "Cinema" and inserting "Cinema and Media";

(B) in subparagraph (G), by striking "Department of Film and Television" and inserting "Department of Film, Television, and Digital Media";

(C) in subparagraph (H), by striking "Film and Television" and inserting "Cinema Studies"; and

(D) by amending subparagraph (L) to read as follows:

"(L) Screen Actors Guild."

(b) NATIONAL FILM PRESERVATION FOUNDATION.—

(1) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 151711(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: by inserting after the first sentence the following:

"(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Library of Congress amounts necessary to carry out this chapter, not to exceed—

"(A) \$530,000 for each of the fiscal years 2005 through 2009;

"(B) \$750,000 for each of the fiscal years 2010 through 2011; and

"(C) \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2012 through 2016.

"(2) MATCHING.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated under this subsection are to be made available to the corporation to match any private contributions (whether in currency, services, or property) made to the corporation by private persons and State and local governments."

(2) REPATRIATION OF FILMS FROM FOREIGN ARCHIVES AS PURPOSE OF FOUNDATION.—Section 151702(l) of such title is amended by striking "United States;" and inserting "United States and the repatriation of American films from foreign archives;"

(3) EXTENSION OF DEADLINE FOR FILLING VACANCIES IN MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—Section 151703(b)(5) of such title is amended by striking "60 days" and inserting "120 days".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill reauthorizes the Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs of the Library of Congress through the year 2016.

The National Film Preservation Board was created in 1988 to address the rapid deterioration of important films. The Film Preservation Board is responsible for identifying and preserving films they deem are "culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant." Along with the National Film Preservation Foundation, the Film Preservation Board ensures that all generations from all over the world will be able to view these remarkable films and experience their power and importance firsthand.

The National Recording Preservation Board was created by the National Recording Preservation Act of 2000. There are currently 225 entries in the National Recording Registry, and that number may only continue to grow. From music to historical speeches, the

Recording Preservation Board makes certain that future generations can experience these historically important and powerful sounds that helped shape decades.

It is necessary that we reauthorize the Recording and Film Boards to allow them to continue their vital mission. We will see to it that those who come after us will be able to listen to and witness those sounds and sights that are essential to our national heritage.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2008.

Hon. ROBERT A. BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on House Administration,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: This is to advise you that, as a result of your working with us to make appropriate revisions to provisions in H.R. 5893, the Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act of 2008, that fall within the rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, we are able to agree to discharging our committee from further consideration of the bill in order that it may proceed without delay to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with the understanding that by foregoing further consideration of H.R. 5893 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. We also reserve the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this important legislation, and request your support if such a request is made.

I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of the bill on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to this request, and for the cooperative relationship between our two committees.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COM-
MITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRA-
TION,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2008.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding your committee's jurisdictional interest in H.R. 5893, a bill to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress.

I appreciate your willingness to support expediting floor consideration of this important legislation today. I understand and agree that this is without prejudice to your Committee's jurisdictional interests in this or similar legislation in the future. In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, I would support your request for an appropriate number of conferees.

I will place a copy of your letter and this response in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 5893. Thank you for your cooperation as we work towards enactment of this legislation.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. BRADY,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 5893, which will reauthorize the Library of Congress's Sound Record and Film Preservation Program. It is an important bill, which will preserve the images and sounds of our Nation's history and make those pieces of the past more accessible to future generations.

The importance of this effort was illustrated just this weekend when Universal Studios in California had a mammoth fire in which some priceless films were lost, and all films, if they were recorded and in the Library of Congress, would not face this problem.

The National Film Preservation Board was formed in 1993 following a study that revealed that America's film heritage was at serious risk due to the degradation of acetate film stock at an alarming rate. Funding for preservation programs had fallen drastically since 1980, creating an urgent need for action. A national plan to protect our Nation's treasures on film was created in 1994 to address the growing need for preservation and to make films more available for education and public exhibition.

I must confess, Mr. Speaker, to some frustration that we have to come in and save the films that the film industry has not taken care of. Obviously they're making enough money when they pull down \$300 million in one weekend for certain films. I would think they would have the wherewithal to preserve their own films. Nevertheless, since they have not, the Congress has had to step in to do it.

In 1999 Congress created the Sound Recording Preservation Program modeled on the successful National Film Preservation Program. This new program would protect historic pieces of audio recordings from deterioration. These audio recordings are extremely important and should be preserved as well. Through the creation of this program, the Sound Recording Preservation Board was instructed to produce a report on the current state of sound recording archiving, preservation and restoration activities, encompassing standards for digital preservation and for access to preserved recordings. The program also includes research on current laws governing sound preservation and how the Library and other institutions can make collections more available to researchers digitally.

This bill will continue the good work started by the Sound Recording and Film Preservation Program staff and their respective boards. Historians, scholars, and citizens will benefit from increased access to these important works, and the items themselves will be preserved for many more generations to come under these programs.

I fully support this bill and thank Chairman BRADY for his efforts to bring this matter to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank Chairman BRADY for yielding, and I also want to commend him for the introduction of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been a great fan of libraries, and, obviously, I'm a great fan of the Library of Congress. And I believe that having as much information and material as we can possibly have is of great benefit not only to the preservation of our history and culture but also a benefit to those who are seeking information, those who want to be educated in many of the different and various ways that education takes place. So I rise in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, so I will attempt to conclude here.

I just want to recognize the good work that the board has done, the importance of the preservation of both visual and audio recordings, as Mr. DAVIS has just said. And it may be that 100, 150 years from now, someone will resurrect Pavarotti, Dizzy Gillespie, Ella Fitzgerald, some of the great musicians of our time, and say look what we have lost in our culture, and we may see a rejuvenation of those.

So I strongly support this bill and urge its passage.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow our cultural, historical or visually significant treasures to disappear into the fog of time. That is why I fully support both reauthorizations contained within H.R. 5893.

Our written traditions have libraries which archive and preserve them. The program we reauthorize today provides a mechanism for similar archiving for sound and visual arts, encouraging their preservation and accessibility for ourselves and for future generations despite rapid changes in visual and sound recording media.

H.R. 5893 would reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress and make a few small changes to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the programs such as by encouraging more active participation by board members.

I am particularly interested in the progress of the Library of Congress on its study and report on sound recordings. In speaking with members of the artist community, it has become clear to me that art forms such as jazz are not being archived, preserved, and restored to the extent necessary to prevent the disappearance of some of the older recordings. This reauthorization will enable the Library of Congress to continue the study and report on ways the National Recording Preservation Board can better ensure the continued availability of seminal pieces of historical jazz and other forms of music.

This country, indeed the world, recently lost a music great, a pioneer who helped lead rhythm and blues into rock and roll, an artist of the highest esteem, "Bo Diddley." Through the continuation of these important archive programs, we can help make sure that Bo Diddley and others will be long remembered for their special contributions to our culture. Though we may mourn the passing of the musician, we need never mourn the loss of the music.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, as always, I would like to thank the ranking member, my friend from Michigan, for his cooperation, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5893, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1215

UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2008

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5972) to make technical corrections to the laws affecting certain administrative authorities of the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5972

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "United States Capitol Police Administrative Technical Corrections Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. ADMINISTRATIVE AUTHORITIES OF THE CHIEF OF THE CAPITOL POLICE.

(a) CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN HIRING AUTHORITIES.—

(1) CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.—Section 108(a) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1903(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There shall be within the Capitol Police an Office of Administration, to be headed by the Chief Administrative Officer, who shall report to and serve at the pleasure of the Chief of the Capitol Police.

"(2) APPOINTMENT.—The Chief Administrative Officer shall be appointed by the Chief of the Capitol Police, after consultation with the Capitol Police Board.

"(3) COMPENSATION.—The annual rate of pay for the Chief Administrative Officer shall be the amount equal to \$1,000 less than the annual rate of pay in effect for the Chief of the Capitol Police."

(2) PERSONNEL OF OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATION.—Section 108(c)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1903(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking "The Chief Administrative Officer" and inserting "The Chief of the Capitol Police"; and

(B) by striking "but shall not" and all that follows and inserting a period.

(3) CERTIFYING OFFICERS.—Section 107 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1904) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking "the Capitol Police Board" and inserting "the Chief of the Capitol Police"; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking "the Capitol Police Board" and inserting "the Chief of the Capitol Police".

(4) REPEAL OF COMMITTEE APPROVAL FOR APPOINTMENTS, TERMINATIONS, AND PROMOTIONS.—Section 1018(e)(1)(B) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 1907(e)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) SPECIAL RULES FOR CERTAIN ACTIONS.—

"(i) PRIOR NOTICE REQUIRED FOR APPOINTMENTS, TERMINATIONS, AND PROMOTIONS.—In carrying out the authority under this paragraph, the Chief of the Capitol Police may carry out any of the following actions only after providing notice to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate and receiving an acknowledgment from each such Committee that the Committee has received the notice:

"(I) The appointment or termination of any officer, member, or employee.

"(II) The promotion of any noncivilian officer, member, or employee to any rank higher than Private First Class or the promotion of any civilian employee to any position.

"(ii) APPROVAL REQUIRED FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW POSITIONS, RECLASSIFICATION OF POSITIONS, AND REORGANIZATION PLANS.—The establishment by the Chief of the Capitol Police of any new position for officers, members, or employees of the Capitol Police, the reclassification by the Chief of any position for officers, members, or employees of the Capitol Police, and any reorganization plan for the Capitol Police shall be subject to the approval of the Committees referred to in clause (i)."

(5) CONFORMING APPLICATION OF CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(9)(D) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301(9)(D)) is amended by striking "the Capitol Police Board," and inserting "the United States Capitol Police."

(B) NO EFFECT ON CURRENT PROCEEDINGS.—Nothing in the amendment made by subparagraph (A) may be construed to affect any procedure initiated under title IV of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) NO EFFECT ON CURRENT PERSONNEL.—Nothing in the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to affect the status of any individual serving as an officer or employee of the United States Capitol Police as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DEPOSIT OF REIMBURSEMENTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2802 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1905) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by striking "Capitol Police Board" each place it appears and inserting "United States Capitol Police"; and

(B) in subsection (a)(2), by striking "Capitol Police Board" and inserting "Chief of the United States Capitol Police".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2001.

(c) AUTHORITY TO SEEK WAIVERS FOR CLAIMS TO RECOVER ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1018(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 1907(a)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) TRANSFER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any statutory function, duty, or authority of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate as disbursing officers for the Capitol Police shall transfer to the Chief of the Capitol Police as the single disbursing officer for the Capitol Police.

"(B) AUTHORITY TO SEEK WAIVERS FOR CLAIMS TO RECOVER ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS.—In the case of the authority to waive a claim of the United States against a person arising out of an erroneous payment of any pay or allowances to an officer or employee of the Capitol Police—

"(i) the Chief of the Capitol Police shall exercise such authority in the same manner as the Secretary of the Senate under section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of erroneous payments of pay and allowances to certain officers and employees of the legislative branch', approved July 25, 1974 (2 U.S.C. 130c);

"(ii) an application for a waiver of such a claim shall be investigated by the Chief Administrative Officer of the Capitol Police, who shall submit a written report of the investigation to the Chief; and

"(iii) an application for a waiver of such a claim in an amount aggregating more than \$1,500 may also be investigated by the Comptroller General, who shall submit a written report of the investigation to the Chief."

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003, except that nothing in the amendment may be construed to affect the validity of any waiver granted prior to the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to a claim of the United States against a person arising out of an erroneous payment of any pay or allowances to an officer or employee of the United States Capitol Police.

(d) MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE ADVANCE PAYMENTS FOR SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1002 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110-161) is amended—

(A) by striking "fiscal year 2008 and each succeeding fiscal year" and inserting "each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2012"; and

(B) by inserting after "the Senate," the following: "the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate,".

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008.

(e) PRIOR NOTICE TO AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES OF DEPLOYMENT OUTSIDE JURISDICTION.—Section 1007(a)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2005 (2 U.S.C. 1978(a)(1)) is amended by striking "prior notification to" and inserting the following: "prior notification to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, and,".

SEC. 3. GENERAL COUNSEL TO THE CHIEF OF POLICE AND THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE.

(a) APPOINTMENT AND SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be within the United States Capitol Police the General Counsel to the Chief of Police and the United States Capitol Police (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the "General Counsel").

(2) APPOINTMENT.—The General Counsel shall be appointed by the Chief of the Capitol Police in accordance with section 1018(e)(1)(B)(i) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C.

1907(e)(1)(B)(i)) (as amended by section 2(a)(4)), without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position.

(3) **COMPENSATION.**—The annual rate of pay for the General Counsel shall be the amount equal to \$1,000 less than the annual rate of pay in effect for the Chief of the Capitol Police.

(4) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—House Resolution 661, Ninety-fifth Congress, agreed to July 29, 1977, as enacted into permanent law by section 111 of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1979 (2 U.S.C. 1901 note) is repealed.

(5) **NO EFFECT ON CURRENT GENERAL COUNSEL.**—Nothing in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection may be construed to affect the status of the individual serving as the General Counsel to the Chief of Police and the United States Capitol Police as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO LEGAL REPRESENTATION AUTHORITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1002(a)(2)(A) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2004 (2 U.S.C. 1908(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “the General Counsel for the United States Capitol Police Board and the Chief of the Capitol Police” and inserting “the General Counsel to the Chief of Police and the United States Capitol Police”.

(2) **NO EFFECT ON CURRENT PROCEEDINGS.**—Nothing in the amendment made by paragraph (1) may be construed to affect the authority of any individual to enter an appearance in any proceeding before any court of the United States or of any State or political subdivision thereof which is initiated prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES REGARDING CERTAIN PERSONNEL BENEFITS.

(a) **NO LUMP SUM PAYMENT PERMITTED FOR UNUSED COMPENSATORY TIME.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—No officer or employee of the United States Capitol Police whose service with the United States Capitol Police is terminated may receive any lump-sum payment with respect to accrued compensatory time off, except to the extent permitted under section 203(c)(4) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1313(c)(4)).

(2) **REPEAL OF RELATED OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.**—(A) Section 3 of House Resolution 449, Ninety-second Congress, agreed to June 2, 1971, as enacted into permanent law by chapter IV of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1972 (85 Stat. 636) (2 U.S.C. 1924), together with any other provision of law which relates to compensatory time for the Capitol Police which is codified at section 1924 of title 2, United States Code (2000 Editions, Supp. V), is hereby repealed.

(B) The last full paragraph under the heading “Administrative Provisions” in the appropriation for the Senate in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1972 (85 Stat. 130) (2 U.S.C. 1925) is hereby repealed.

(b) **OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES EXEMPT FROM FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938.**—

(1) **CRITERIA UNDER WHICH COMPENSATION PERMITTED.**—The Chief of the Capitol Police may provide for the compensation of overtime work of exempt individuals which is performed on or after the date of the enactment of this Act, in the form of additional pay or compensatory time off, only if—

(A) the overtime work is carried out in connection with special circumstances, as determined by the Chief;

(B) the Chief has established a monetary value for the overtime work performed by such individual; and

(C) the sum of the total amount of the compensation paid to the individual for the overtime work (as determined on the basis of the monetary value established under subparagraph (B)) and the total regular compensation paid to the individual with respect to the pay period involved may not exceed an amount equal to the cap on the aggregate amount of annual compensation that may be paid to the individual under applicable law during the year in which the pay period occurs, as allocated on a per pay period basis consistent with premium pay regulations of the Capitol Police Board.

(2) **EXEMPT INDIVIDUALS DEFINED.**—In this subsection, an “exempt individual” is an officer or employee of the United States Capitol Police—

(A) who is classified under regulations issued pursuant to section 203 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1313) as exempt from the application of the rights and protections established by subsections (a)(1) and (d) of section 6, section 7, and section 12(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206 (a)(1) and (d), 207, 212(c)); or

(B) whose annual rate of pay is not established specifically under any law.

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1009 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7; 117 Stat. 359) is repealed.

(B) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subparagraph (A) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003, except that the amendment shall not apply with respect to any overtime work performed prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO SUSPEND EMPLOYEES FOR APPROPRIATE REASONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1018(e)(1)(A) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (2 U.S.C. 1907(e)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “suspend with or without pay,” after “hire.”

(2) **REPEAL OF RELATED OBSOLETE PROVISIONS.**—(A) Section 1823 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 1928) is hereby repealed.

(B) The proviso in the Act of Mar. 3, 1875 (ch. 129; 18 Stat. 345.), popularly known as the “Legislature, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1876”, which is codified at section 1929 of title 2, United States Code (2000 Editions, Supp. V), is repealed.

SEC. 5. OTHER MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) **REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROCEDURES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER.**—Section 108 of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 1903) is amended by striking subsections (d) through (g).

(b) **REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT THAT OFFICERS PURCHASE OWN UNIFORMS.**—Section 1825 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 1943) is repealed.

(c) **REPEAL OF REFERENCES TO OFFICERS AND PRIVATES IN AUTHORITIES RELATING TO HOUSE AND SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS.**—

(1) **HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS.**—The item relating to “House of Representatives Office Building” in the Act entitled “An Act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June thirtieth, nineteen hundred and eight, and for other purposes”, approved March 4, 1907 (34 Stat. 1365; 2 U.S.C. 2001), is amended by striking “other than officers and privates of the Capitol police” each place it appears and inserting “other than the United States Capitol Police”.

(2) **SENATE OFFICE BUILDINGS.**—The item relating to “Senate Office Building” in the

Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1943 (56 Stat. 343; 2 U.S.C. 2023) is amended by striking “other than for officers and privates of the Capitol Police” each place it appears and inserting “other than for the United States Capitol Police”.

(d) **CLARIFICATION OF APPLICABILITY OF U.S. CAPITOL POLICE AND LIBRARY OF CONGRESS POLICE MERGER IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2007.**—

(1) **REPEAL OF DUPLICATE PROVISIONS.**—Effective as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161), section 1004 of such Act is repealed, and any provision of law amended or repealed by such section is restored or revived to read as if such section had not been enacted into law.

(2) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER ACT.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) may be construed to prevent the enactment or implementation of any provision of the U.S. Capitol Police and Library of Congress Police Merger Implementation Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–178), including any provision of such Act that amends or repeals a provision of law which is restored or revived pursuant to paragraph (1).

(e) **AUTHORITY OF CHIEF OF POLICE.**—

(1) **REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS CODIFIED IN TITLE 2, UNITED STATES CODE.**—The provisions appearing in the first paragraph under the heading “Capitol Police” in the Act of April 28, 1902 (ch. 594, 32 Stat. 124), and the provisions appearing in the first paragraph under the heading “Capitol Police” in title I of the Legislative and Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1944 (ch. 173, 57 Stat. 230), insofar as all of those provisions are related to the sentence “The captain and lieutenants shall be selected jointly by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives; and one-half of the privates shall be selected by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and one-half by the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.”, which appears in 2 U.S.C. 1901 (2000 Edition, Supp. V), are repealed.

(2) **RESTORATION OF REPEALED PROVISION.**—Section 1018(h)(1) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 108–7, div. H, title I, 117 Stat. 368) is repealed, and the sentence “The Capitol Police shall be headed by a Chief who shall be appointed by the Capitol Police Board and shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.”, which was repealed by such section, is restored to appear at the end of section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 1901).

(3) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The first sentence of section 1821 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 1901) is amended by striking “, the members of which shall be appointed by the Sergeants-at-Arms of the two Houses and the Architect of the Capitol Extension”.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2003.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to present the United States Capitol Police Administrative Technical Corrections Act of 2008. As its title suggests, H.R. 5972 is not intended to make substantive policy changes for the Capitol Police. It corrects drafting errors, modernizes outdated terms, and repeals redundant and inconsistent provisions already on the books.

My favorite correction is a long overdue repeal of the 1868 law requiring Capitol Police officers to buy their uniforms. Congress decided years ago to provide their uniforms, but has never repealed the 1868 law. Chief Phillip Morse requested most of these corrections, the committee found others, and we included several excellent suggestions offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). Again, it was a pleasure to work with him and his staff, as always.

The bill has the support of Chief Morse and our House Sergeant-at-Arms, Wilson Livingood, and I urge an "aye" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5972. While I would have preferred that we would have addressed these items in regular order, I am pleased that the proposed technical corrections in this bill will create a stronger operational framework for the Capitol Police. As often happens when language is tied to an appropriations bill in a hasty fashion, several requirements in the original legislation governing Capitol Police operations proved problematic under greater scrutiny and further use. This bill will bring clarity to the administration of the U.S. Capitol Police and will eliminate those provisions which are in conflict with one another or are antiquated and therefore unnecessary.

I would also point out that this illustrates the importance of the appropriations subcommittees to work together with the authorizing committees, because virtually all the problems that have arisen in the past in this area resulted from a lack of cooperation between the authorizing and appropriating committees.

The changes specified in this bill will also establish a transparent and decisive governance framework and create a clear reporting structure within the U.S. Capitol Police. The clarified language provides the Chief of the Capitol Police with explicit authority to perform all hiring and termination actions, which will assist the U.S. Capitol Police's legal staff in executing its duties regarding personnel matters.

This bill also clarifies that the Capitol Police must notify this committee, as well as the Senate Rules and Administration Committee, of substantive administrative and operational actions, such as notices of personnel actions or deployment of personnel outside of the

Capitol Police's jurisdiction. This language further strengthens this committee's function as an oversight body and allows us to address any such issues as they occur.

I thank Chairman BRADY for his work on this bill, which will, upon its passage, create a stronger law enforcement organization, and a safer, more secure Capitol complex.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. I have no further speakers.

Mr. EHLERS. I have no further speakers. I will make some concluding comments.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my chairman, Mr. BRADY. He and I have worked very, very well together on a number of issues, and I believe that, if there were a competition, we would probably hold the prize among the committees of the House as to the best functioning committees who really try to get business done without a lot of partisanship. I commend my colleague for his great attitude on this.

One other comment I will make in regard to the Capitol Police. The one area we did not examine, which I think needs examination at some point, and I hope our committee will take it up at some point, the duties of the Capitol Police Board are not as clearly outlined as they might be. The composition, I believe, is lacking. We have a GAO report of a few years ago which pointed out some severe shortcomings in the operations and decision-making processes of the Capitol Police Board, and I think we would be well-served in this institution to re-examine that issue.

We have done so much in the past decade to modernize the police force; make them provide more ready responses to the trauma that we face today in this time of terrorism. I think we would be well-advised to look at the governing structure once again too, which to my knowledge, has not been examined for a long time.

With that, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Again, I thank the gentleman from Michigan. He is right: it is a pleasure to work together. I look forward to working together with you in your interest on the Capitol Police Board. With that, I urge an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5972, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5940) to authorize activities for support of nanotechnology research and development, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5940

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

The 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 2(c)(4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

"(4) develop, within 12 months after the date of enactment of the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008, and update every 3 years thereafter, a strategic plan to guide the activities described under subsection (b) that specifies near-term and long-term objectives for the Program, the anticipated time frame for achieving the near-term objectives, and the metrics to be used for assessing progress toward the objectives, and that describes—

"(A) how the Program will move results out of the laboratory and into applications for the benefit of society, including through cooperation and collaborations with nanotechnology research, development, and technology transition initiatives supported by the States;

"(B) how the Program will encourage and support interdisciplinary research and development in nanotechnology; and

"(C) proposed research in areas of national importance in accordance with the requirements of section 5 of the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008;"

(2) in section 2—

(A) in subsection (d)—

(i) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as paragraphs (2) through (6), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting the following new paragraph before paragraph (2), as so redesignated by clause (i) of this subparagraph:

"(1) the Program budget, for the previous fiscal year, for each agency that participates in the Program, including a breakout of spending for the development and acquisition of research facilities and instrumentation, for each program component area, and for all activities pursuant to subsection (b)(10);" and

(B) by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) STANDARDS SETTING.—The agencies participating in the Program shall support the activities of committees involved in the development of standards for nanotechnology and may reimburse the travel costs of scientists and engineers who participate in activities of such committees;"

(3) by striking section 3(b) and inserting the following new subsection:

"(b) FUNDING.—(1) The operation of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall be supported by funds from each agency participating in the Program. The portion of such Office's total budget provided by each agency for each fiscal year shall be in the same proportion as the agency's share of the total budget for the Program for the previous fiscal year, as specified in the report required under section 2(d)(1).

“(2) The annual report under section 2(d) shall include—

“(A) a description of the funding required by the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office to perform the functions specified under subsection (a) for the next fiscal year by category of activity, including the funding required to carry out the requirements of section 2(b)(10)(D), subsection (d) of this section, and section 5;

“(B) a description of the funding required by such Office to perform the functions specified under subsection (a) for the current fiscal year by category of activity, including the funding required to carry out the requirements of subsection (d); and

“(C) the amount of funding provided for such Office for the current fiscal year by each agency participating in the Program.”;

(4) by inserting at the end of section 3 the following new subsection:

“(d) PUBLIC INFORMATION.—(1) The National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall develop and maintain a database accessible by the public of projects funded under the Environmental, Health, and Safety, the Education and Societal Dimensions, and the Nanomanufacturing program component areas, or any successor program component areas, including a description of each project, its source of funding by agency, and its funding history. For the Environmental, Health, and Safety program component area, or any successor program component area, projects shall be grouped by major objective as defined by the research plan required under section 3(b) of the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008. For the Education and Societal Dimensions program component area, or any successor program component area, the projects shall be grouped in subcategories of—

“(A) education in formal settings;

“(B) education in informal settings;

“(C) public outreach; and

“(D) ethical, legal, and other societal issues.

“(2) The National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall develop, maintain, and publicize information on nanotechnology facilities supported under the Program, and may include information on nanotechnology facilities supported by the States, that are accessible for use by individuals from academic institutions and from industry. The information shall include at a minimum the terms and conditions for the use of each facility, a description of the capabilities of the instruments and equipment available for use at the facility, and a description of the technical support available to assist users of the facility.”;

(5) in section 4(a)—

(A) by striking “or designate”;

(B) by inserting “as a distinct entity” after “Advisory Panel”; and

(C) by inserting at the end “The Advisory Panel shall form a subpanel with membership having specific qualifications tailored to enable it to carry out the requirements of subsection (c)(7).”;

(6) in section 4(b)—

(A) by striking “or designated” and “or designating”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “At least one member of the Advisory Panel shall be an individual employed by and representing a minority-serving institution.”;

(7) by amending section 5 to read as follows:

“SEC. 5. TRIENNIAL EXTERNAL REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a triennial review of the Program. The Director shall ensure that the arrangement with the National Research Council is concluded in order to allow sufficient time for the reporting requirements of subsection (b)

to be satisfied. Each triennial review shall include an evaluation of the—

“(1) research priorities and technical content of the Program, including whether the allocation of funding among program component areas, as designated according to section 2(c)(2), is appropriate;

“(2) effectiveness of the Program’s management and coordination across agencies and disciplines, including an assessment of the effectiveness of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office;

“(3) Program’s scientific and technological accomplishments and its success in transferring technology to the private sector; and

“(4) adequacy of the Program’s activities addressing ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal concerns, including human health concerns.

“(b) EVALUATION TO BE TRANSMITTED TO CONGRESS.—The National Research Council shall document the results of each triennial review carried out in accordance with subsection (a) in a report that includes any recommendations for ways to improve the Program’s management and coordination processes and for changes to the Program’s objectives, funding priorities, and technical content. Each report shall be submitted to the Director of the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office, who shall transmit it to the Advisory Panel, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives not later than September 30 of every third year, with the first report due September 30, 2009.

“(c) FUNDING.—Of the amounts provided in accordance with section 3(b)(1), the following amounts shall be available to carry out this section:

“(1) \$500,000 for fiscal year 2009.

“(2) \$500,000 for fiscal year 2010.

“(3) \$500,000 for fiscal year 2011.”; and

(8) in section 10—

(A) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) NANOTECHNOLOGY.—The term ‘nanotechnology’ means the science and technology that will enable one to understand, measure, manipulate, and manufacture at the nanoscale, aimed at creating materials, devices, and systems with fundamentally new properties or functions.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(7) NANOSCALE.—The term ‘nanoscale’ means one or more dimensions of between approximately 1 and 100 nanometers.”.

SEC. 3. SOCIETAL DIMENSIONS OF NANOTECHNOLOGY.

(a) COORDINATOR FOR SOCIETAL DIMENSIONS OF NANOTECHNOLOGY.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall designate an associate director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy as the Coordinator for Societal Dimensions of Nanotechnology. The Coordinator shall be responsible for oversight of the coordination, planning, and budget prioritization of activities required by section 2(b)(10) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(10)). The Coordinator shall, with the assistance of appropriate senior officials of the agencies funding activities within the Environmental, Health, and Safety and the Education and Societal Dimensions program component areas of the Program, or any successor program component areas, ensure that the requirements of such section 2(b)(10) are satisfied. The responsibilities of the Coordinator shall include—

(1) ensuring that a research plan for the environmental, health, and safety research activities required under subsection (b) is developed, updated, and implemented and that the plan is responsive to the recommendations of the subpanel of the Advisory Panel established

under section 4(a) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7503(a)), as amended by this Act;

(2) encouraging and monitoring the efforts of the agencies participating in the Program to allocate the level of resources and management attention necessary to ensure that the ethical, legal, environmental, and other appropriate societal concerns related to nanotechnology, including human health concerns, are addressed under the Program, including the implementation of the research plan described in subsection (b); and

(3) encouraging the agencies required to develop the research plan under subsection (b) to identify, assess, and implement suitable mechanisms for the establishment of public-private partnerships for support of environmental, health, and safety research.

(b) RESEARCH PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Coordinator for Societal Dimensions of Nanotechnology shall convene and chair a panel comprised of representatives from the agencies funding research activities under the Environmental, Health, and Safety program component area of the Program, or any successor program component area, and from such other agencies as the Coordinator considers necessary to develop, periodically update, and coordinate the implementation of a research plan for this program component area. In developing and updating the plan, the panel convened by the Coordinator shall solicit and be responsive to recommendations and advice from—

(A) the subpanel of the Advisory Panel established under section 4(a) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7503(a)), as amended by this Act; and

(B) the agencies responsible for environmental, health, and safety regulations associated with the production, use, and disposal of nanoscale materials and products.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall include a description of how the Program will help to ensure the development of—

(A) standards related to nomenclature associated with engineered nanoscale materials;

(B) engineered nanoscale standard reference materials for environmental, health, and safety testing; and

(C) standards related to methods and procedures for detecting, measuring, monitoring, sampling, and testing engineered nanoscale materials for environmental, health, and safety impacts.

(3) COMPONENTS OF PLAN.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall, with respect to activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) specify near-term research objectives and long-term research objectives;

(B) specify milestones associated with each near-term objective and the estimated time and resources required to reach each milestone;

(C) with respect to subparagraphs (A) and (B), describe the role of each agency carrying out or sponsoring research in order to meet the objectives specified under subparagraph (A) and to achieve the milestones specified under subparagraph (B);

(D) specify the funding allocated to each major objective of the plan and the source of funding by agency for the current fiscal year; and

(E) estimate the funding required for each major objective of the plan and the source of funding by agency for the following 3 fiscal years.

(4) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives.

(5) UPDATING AND APPENDING TO REPORT.—The plan required under paragraph (1) shall be updated annually and appended to the report

required under section 2(d) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(d)).

(c) **NANOTECHNOLOGY PARTNERSHIPS.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—As part of the program authorized by section 9 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002, the Director of the National Science Foundation shall provide 1 or more grants to establish partnerships as defined by subsection (a)(2) of that section, except that each such partnership shall include 1 or more businesses engaged in the production of nanoscale materials, products, or devices. Partnerships established in accordance with this subsection shall be designated as “Nanotechnology Education Partnerships”.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—Nanotechnology Education Partnerships shall be designed to recruit and help prepare secondary school students to pursue postsecondary level courses of instruction in nanotechnology. At a minimum, grants shall be used to support—

(A) professional development activities to enable secondary school teachers to use curricular materials incorporating nanotechnology and to inform teachers about career possibilities for students in nanotechnology;

(B) enrichment programs for students, including access to nanotechnology facilities and equipment at partner institutions, to increase their understanding of nanoscale science and technology and to inform them about career possibilities in nanotechnology as scientists, engineers, and technicians; and

(C) identification of appropriate nanotechnology educational materials and incorporation of nanotechnology into the curriculum for secondary school students at one or more organizations participating in a Partnership.

(3) **SELECTION.**—Grants under this subsection shall be awarded in accordance with subsection (b) of such section 9, except that paragraph (3)(B) of that subsection shall not apply.

(d) **UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED.**—As part of the activities included under the Education and Societal Dimensions program component area, or any successor program component area, the Program shall support efforts to introduce nanoscale science, engineering, and technology into undergraduate science and engineering education through a variety of interdisciplinary approaches. Activities supported may include—

(A) development of courses of instruction or modules to existing courses;

(B) faculty professional development; and

(C) acquisition of equipment and instrumentation suitable for undergraduate education and research in nanotechnology.

(2) **COURSE, CURRICULUM, AND LABORATORY IMPROVEMENT AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation to carry out activities described in paragraph (1) through the Course, Curriculum, and Laboratory Improvement program—

(A) from amounts authorized under section 7002(b)(2)(B) of the America COMPETES Act, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

(B) from amounts authorized under section 7002(c)(2)(B) of the America COMPETES Act, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(3) **ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AUTHORIZATION.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Director of the National Science Foundation to carry out activities described in paragraph (1) through the Advanced Technology Education program—

(A) from amounts authorized under section 7002(b)(2)(B) of the America COMPETES Act, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2009; and

(B) from amounts authorized under section 7002(c)(2)(B) of the America COMPETES Act, \$5,000,000 for fiscal year 2010.

(e) **INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.**—The National Science and Technology Council shall establish under the Nanoscale Science, Engineering, and Technology Subcommittee an Edu-

cation Working Group to coordinate, prioritize, and plan the educational activities supported under the Program.

(f) **SOCIETAL DIMENSIONS IN NANOTECHNOLOGY EDUCATION ACTIVITIES.**—Activities supported under the Education and Societal Dimensions program component area, or any successor program component area, that involve informal, precollege, or undergraduate nanotechnology education shall include education regarding the environmental, health and safety, and other societal aspects of nanotechnology.

(g) **REMOTE ACCESS TO NANOTECHNOLOGY FACILITIES.**—(1) Agencies supporting nanotechnology research facilities as part of the Program shall require the entities that operate such facilities to allow access via the Internet, and support the costs associated with the provision of such access, by secondary school students and teachers, to instruments and equipment within such facilities for educational purposes. The agencies may waive this requirement for cases when particular facilities would be inappropriate for educational purposes or the costs for providing such access would be prohibitive.

(2) The agencies identified in paragraph (1) shall require the entities that operate such nanotechnology research facilities to establish and publish procedures, guidelines, and conditions for the submission and approval of applications for the use of the facilities for the purpose identified in paragraph (1) and shall authorize personnel who operate the facilities to provide necessary technical support to students and teachers.

SEC. 4. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER.

(a) **PROTOTYPING.**—

(1) **ACCESS TO FACILITIES.**—In accordance with section 2(b)(7) of 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(7)), the agencies supporting nanotechnology research facilities as part of the Program shall provide access to such facilities to companies for the purpose of assisting the companies in the development of prototypes of nanoscale products, devices, or processes (or products, devices, or processes enabled by nanotechnology) for determining proof of concept. The agencies shall publicize the availability of these facilities and encourage their use by companies as provided for in this section.

(2) **PROCEDURES.**—The agencies identified in paragraph (1)—

(A) shall establish and publish procedures, guidelines, and conditions for the submission and approval of applications for use of nanotechnology facilities;

(B) shall publish descriptions of the capabilities of facilities available for use under this subsection, including the availability of technical support; and

(C) may waive recovery, require full recovery, or require partial recovery of the costs associated with use of the facilities for projects under this subsection.

(3) **SELECTION AND CRITERIA.**—In cases when less than full cost recovery is required pursuant to paragraph (2)(C), projects provided access to nanotechnology facilities in accordance with this subsection shall be selected through a competitive, merit-based process, and the criteria for the selection of such projects shall include at a minimum—

(A) the readiness of the project for technology demonstration;

(B) evidence of a commitment by the applicant for further development of the project to full commercialization if the proof of concept is established by the prototype; and

(C) evidence of the potential for further funding from private sector sources following the successful demonstration of proof of concept.

The agencies may give special consideration in selecting projects to applications that are relevant to important national needs or requirements.

(b) **USE OF EXISTING TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **PARTICIPATING AGENCIES.**—Each agency participating in the Program shall—

(A) encourage the submission of applications for support of nanotechnology related projects to the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program administered by such agencies; and

(B) through the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office and within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives—

(i) the plan described in section 2(c)(7) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(c)(7)); and

(ii) a report specifying, if the agency administers a Small Business Innovation Research Program and a Small Business Technology Transfer Program—

(I) the number of proposals received for nanotechnology related projects during the current fiscal year and the previous 2 fiscal years;

(II) the number of such proposals funded in each year;

(III) the total number of nanotechnology related projects funded and the amount of funding provided for fiscal year 2003 through fiscal year 2007; and

(IV) a description of the projects identified in accordance with subclause (III) which received private sector funding beyond the period of phase II support.

(2) **NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology in carrying out the requirements of section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) shall—

(A) in regard to subsection (d) of that section, encourage the submission of proposals for support of nanotechnology related projects; and

(B) in regard to subsection (g) of that section, include a description of how the requirement of subparagraph (A) of this paragraph is being met, the number of proposals for nanotechnology related projects received, the number of such proposals funded, the total number of such projects funded since the beginning of the Technology Innovation Program, and the outcomes of such funded projects in terms of the metrics developed in accordance with such subsection (g).

(3) **TIP ADVISORY BOARD.**—The TIP Advisory Board established under section 28(k) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(k)), in carrying out its responsibilities under subsection (k)(3), shall provide the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology with—

(A) advice on how to accomplish the requirement of paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection; and

(B) an assessment of the adequacy of the allocation of resources for nanotechnology related projects supported under the Technology Innovation Program.

(c) **INDUSTRY LIAISON GROUPS.**—An objective of the Program shall be to establish industry liaison groups for all industry sectors that would benefit from applications of nanotechnology. The Nanomanufacturing, Industry Liaison, and Innovation Working Group of the National Science and Technology Council shall actively pursue establishing such liaison groups.

(d) **COORDINATION WITH STATE INITIATIVES.**—Section 2(b)(5) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) ensuring United States global leadership in the development and application of nanotechnology, including through coordination and leveraging Federal investments with nanotechnology research, development, and technology transition initiatives supported by the States;”.

SEC. 5. RESEARCH IN AREAS OF NATIONAL IMPORTANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Program shall include support for nanotechnology research and development activities directed toward application areas that have the potential for significant contributions to national economic competitiveness and for other significant societal benefits. The activities supported shall be designed to advance the development of research discoveries by demonstrating technical solutions to important problems in such areas as nano-electronics, energy efficiency, health care, and water remediation and purification. The Advisory Panel shall make recommendations to the Program for candidate research and development areas for support under this section.

(b) CHARACTERISTICS.

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Research and development activities under this section shall—

(A) include projects selected on the basis of applications for support through a competitive, merit-based process;

(B) involve collaborations among researchers in academic institutions and industry, and may involve nonprofit research institutions and Federal laboratories, as appropriate;

(C) when possible, leverage Federal investments through collaboration with related State initiatives; and

(D) include a plan for fostering the transfer of research discoveries and the results of technology demonstration activities to industry for commercial development.

(2) **PROCEDURES.**—Determination of the requirements for applications under this subsection, review and selection of applications for support, and subsequent funding of projects shall be carried out by a collaboration of no fewer than 2 agencies participating in the Program. In selecting applications for support, the agencies shall give special consideration to projects that include cost sharing from non-Federal sources.

(3) **INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CENTERS.**—Research and development activities under this section may be supported through interdisciplinary nanotechnology research centers, as authorized by section 2(b)(4) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(4)), that are organized to investigate basic research questions and carry out technology demonstration activities in areas such as those identified in subsection (a).

(c) **REPORT.**—Reports required under section 2(d) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(d)) shall include a description of research and development areas supported in accordance with this section, including the same budget information as is required for program component areas under paragraphs (1) and (2) of such section 2(d).

SEC. 6. NANOMANUFACTURING RESEARCH.

(a) **RESEARCH AREAS.**—The Nanomanufacturing program component area, or any successor program component area, shall include research on—

(1) development of instrumentation and tools required for the rapid characterization of nanoscale materials and for monitoring of nanoscale manufacturing processes; and

(2) approaches and techniques for scaling the synthesis of new nanoscale materials to achieve industrial-level production rates.

(b) **GREEN NANOTECHNOLOGY.**—Interdisciplinary research centers supported under the Program in accordance with section 2(b)(4) of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7501(b)(4)) that are focused on nanomanufacturing research and centers established under the authority of section 5(b)(3) of this Act shall include as part of the activities of such centers—

(1) research on methods and approaches to develop environmentally benign nanoscale products and nanoscale manufacturing processes, taking into consideration relevant findings and

results of research supported under the Environmental, Health, and Safety program component area, or any successor program component area;

(2) fostering the transfer of the results of such research to industry; and

(3) providing for the education of scientists and engineers through interdisciplinary studies in the principles and techniques for the design and development of environmentally benign nanoscale products and processes.

(c) REVIEW OF NANOMANUFACTURING RESEARCH AND RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(1) **PUBLIC MEETING.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Nanotechnology Coordination Office shall sponsor a public meeting, including representation from a wide range of industries engaged in nanoscale manufacturing, to—

(A) obtain the views of participants at the meeting on—

(i) the relevance and value of the research being carried out under the Nanomanufacturing program component area of the Program, or any successor program component area; and

(ii) whether the capabilities of nanotechnology research facilities supported under the Program are adequate—

(I) to meet current and near-term requirements for the fabrication and characterization of nanoscale devices and systems; and

(II) to provide access to and use of instrumentation and equipment at the facilities, by means of networking technology, to individuals who are at locations remote from the facilities; and

(B) receive any recommendations on ways to strengthen the research portfolio supported under the Nanomanufacturing program component area, or any successor program component area, and on improving the capabilities of nanotechnology research facilities supported under the Program.

Companies participating in industry liaison groups shall be invited to participate in the meeting. The Coordination Office shall prepare a report documenting the findings and recommendations resulting from the meeting.

(2) **ADVISORY PANEL REVIEW.**—The Advisory Panel shall review the Nanomanufacturing program component area of the Program, or any successor program component area, and the capabilities of nanotechnology research facilities supported under the Program to assess—

(A) whether the funding for the Nanomanufacturing program component area, or any successor program component area, is adequate and receiving appropriate priority within the overall resources available for the Program;

(B) the relevance of the research being supported to the identified needs and requirements of industry;

(C) whether the capabilities of nanotechnology research facilities supported under the Program are adequate—

(i) to meet current and near-term requirements for the fabrication and characterization of nanoscale devices and systems; and

(ii) to provide access to and use of instrumentation and equipment at the facilities, by means of networking technology, to individuals who are at locations remote from the facilities; and

(D) the level of funding that would be needed to support—

(i) the acquisition of instrumentation, equipment, and networking technology sufficient to provide the capabilities at nanotechnology research facilities described in subparagraph (C); and

(ii) the operation and maintenance of such facilities.

In carrying out its assessment, the Advisory Panel shall take into consideration the findings and recommendations from the report required under paragraph (1).

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Advisory Panel shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Sen-

ate and the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on its assessment required under paragraph (2), along with any recommendations and a copy of the report prepared in accordance with paragraph (1).

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act, terms that are defined in section 10 of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (15 U.S.C. 7509) have the meaning given those terms in that section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 5940, the bill now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 5940 is a bipartisan bill which myself and Ranking Member HALL jointly introduced, along with 23 additional Democratic and Republican members of the Science and Technology Committee. The committee believes this legislation will strengthen our Nation's competitiveness in the rapidly advancing field of nanotechnology.

I want to particularly thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, for working with me to craft this legislation. I also want to thank Dr. BAIRD, the Chair, and Dr. EHLERS, the ranking member, respectively, of the Research and Science Education Subcommittee, who were both instrumental in development of this bill.

Finally, I want to thank all the members of the Science and Technology Committee on both sides of the aisle for their contributions to this bill and for helping to move it expeditiously and unanimously through the committee. Certainly, I want to thank Jim Wilson, working with the minority and majority staff, in putting together this excellent piece of legislation.

The term "revolutionary technology" has become a cliché, but nanotechnology truly is revolutionary. We stand at the threshold of an age in which materials and devices can be fashioned atom by atom to satisfy specific design requirements. Nanotechnology-based applications are arising that were not even imagined a decade ago.

The range of potential applications of nanotechnology is broad and will have enormous consequences for electronics, energy transformation, storage materials, and medicine and health, to name just a few. Indeed, the scope of this technology is so broad as to leave virtually no product untouched.

The Science and Technology Committee recognized the promise of nanotechnology early on, holding our first hearing a decade ago to review Federal activities in the field. The committee was substantially instrumental in development and enactment in 2003 of the 21st Century Nanotechnology Research and Development Act, which authorized the multi-agency National Nanotechnology Initiative, or the NNI, as it's called.

The 2003 statute put in place formal interagency planning, budgeting, and coordinating mechanisms for the NNI. It now receives funding from 13 agencies and has a budget of \$1.5 billion for fiscal year 2008. The NNI statute also provides for formal reviews of the content and management of programs by the National Academy of Sciences and by a designated advisory committee of nongovernmental experts. Their assessment of the NNI has been generally positive.

The NNI supports productive cooperative research efforts across a spectrum of disciplines and is establishing a network of national facilities for further support of nanotechnology research and development. H.R. 5940 is based on findings and recommendations from several hearings during the current Congress that examined various aspects of the NNI. It also reflects recommendations from the formal reviews of the NNI by the National Academy of Sciences and the NNI advisory panel. Finally, it incorporates many suggestions from various communities of interest that reviewed early versions of the bill.

H.R. 5940 does not substantially alter the NNI, but makes adjustments to some of the priorities of the programs and strengthens one of the core components, environmental and safety research.

Nanotechnology is advancing rapidly, and at least 600 products have entered commerce that contain nanoscale materials, including aerosols and cosmetics. It is important for the successful development of nanotechnology that potential downsides of nanotechnology be addressed from the beginning in a straight forward and open way.

We know too well that negative public perceptions about the safety of technology can have serious consequences for its acceptance and use. At present, the level of scientific understanding is sufficient to pin down what types of engineered nanomaterials may be dangerous, although early studies show some are potentially harmful.

One example is the recent finding that certain types of carbon nanotubes may mimic the effect of asbestos in causing cancer. More research is needed to determine what characteristics of nanoscale materials are most significant with regard to determining their effects on living organisms or on the environment.

Although the NNI from its beginning has included research to increase un-

derstanding of environmental and safety aspects of nanotechnology, it has not yet put in place a well-designed, adequately funded and an effectively executed research program in this area. The environmental and safety component of NNI must be improved by quickly developing a research plan and implementation strategy that specifies near-term and long-term goals, sets milestones and timeframes for meeting near-term goals, clarifies agencies' roles in implementing the plan, and allocates sufficient resources to accomplish those goals.

This is the first essential step for the development of nanotechnology to ensure that sound science guides the formation of regulatory rules and requirements. It will reduce the current uncertainty that inhibits commercial development of nanotechnology and will provide a sound basis for future rule-making.

H.R. 5940 addresses risk reduction research by requiring that the NNI agencies develop a plan for the environmental and safety research component of the program, as well as a roadmap to implementing it. This plan must include explicit near-term and long-term goals, specify the funding required to reach these goals, and identify the role of each participating agency.

The bill also assigns responsibility to a senior official at the Office of Science and Technology Policy at the White House to oversee this planning and implementation process and to ensure the agencies allocate the resources necessary to carry it out.

Finally, the bill requires accountability by establishing a publicly accessible database containing information on the content and funding for each environmental health and safety research project supported by the NNI.

Another key component of H.R. 5940 I want to highlight involves provisions to help capture the economic benefits of nanotechnology.

□ 1230

Too often, the U.S. has led in the basic research on the frontiers of science and technology, but has failed to capitalize on commercial development flowing from these new discoveries.

The NNI has so far invested approximately \$7 billion over 7 years in basic research that is providing new tools for manipulation of matter at the nanoscale and is increasing our understanding of the behavior of engineered nanoscale materials and devices. Increased consideration should be given to ways to foster the transfer of new discoveries to commercial products and processes. To that end, H.R. 5940 includes provisions to encourage use of nanotechnology research facilities by companies for prototyping and proof of concept studies and it specifies steps for increasing the number of nanotechnology-related projects supported under the Small Business Innovation Research initiative and by the Tech-

nology Innovation Program, established under the COMPETES Act.

To increase the relevancy and value of NNI, the bill also authorizes large-scale, focused, multi-agency research and development initiatives in areas of national need. This approach will advance the development of promising research discoveries for demonstrating technical solutions in targeted areas, which will contribute to economic competitiveness and other social benefits. For example, such efforts could be organized around the development and replacement of silicone-based transistors, developing new nanotechnology-based devices for harvesting solar energy, and nanoscale sensors for detecting cancer.

Finally, I want to highlight some provisions of the bill that address another key issue, future STEM workforce needs. The Nation needs a full pipeline of talented engineers, scientists and technicians and a scientifically literate public able to exploit and understand this new science.

One provision of H.R. 5940 builds on the National Science Foundation's Math and Science Partnership Program to use nanotechnology education activities as a vehicle to raise the interest of secondary students in possible STEM careers. A key component of these new partnerships is involvement by the nanotechnology companies in offering hands-on learning opportunities at their facilities for students and teachers.

Another educational provision supports the development of undergraduate courses of study in nanotechnology fields. This will help prepare future technicians, scientists and engineers who will be needed to meet the demands of industry as nanotechnology commercialization continues to expand.

Mr. Speaker, nanotechnology will soon touch the lives of all Americans. It is already in our cell phones, cosmetics, paints and clothing. It will soon help to protect the lives of our police officers and military servicemen, and is showing promise in the treatment of cancer and promoting wound healing. There is no doubt that the potential of this technology is great. The bill before us today goes a long way toward ensuring that nanotechnology is developed in a safe and environmentally benign way, and that the Nation reaps the benefits of our research investment.

H.R. 5940 has the support of many business and professional associations, including the Semiconductor Industry Association, the NanoBusiness Alliance, the American Chemical Society, the American Physical Society, SEMI North America, the National Chemistry Council, the American Electronics Association, the Association of Science-Technology Centers, IEEE-USA, Materials Research Society, Semiconductor Research Corporation,

the National Science Teachers Association, American Psychological Association, the American Institute for Medical and Biological Engineering, Texas Instruments, IBM and Applied Materials, among just a few.

These organizations, like my colleagues on the Science and Technology Committee, recognize that H.R. 5940 will enhance America's efforts in nanotechnology research and development and will help bring its many benefits to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this bipartisan legislation to my colleagues and urge their support for its passage in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) will control the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5940, the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I control time for what we call the opposition for the legislation here today, but I guess that is just a mere technicality, because I am pleased to join Chairman GORDON as well as an overwhelming majority of our committee members on both sides of the aisle as an original cosponsor of H.R. 5940, the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008.

The initiative was first named in the 2001 budget request and made a priority by President Bush. We codified it in 2003, and I was pleased to cosponsor that measure as well then. Now we have taken an already good statute and improved it just a bit, and streamlined some administrative issues to ensure that areas such as nanomanufacturing, education and environmental health and safety are adequately recognized.

It is mind-boggling to realize that the piece of paper that I am reading from is 100,000 nanometers thick. 100,000 nanometers. The fact that our scientists and engineers can create and manipulate matter on that small of a scale to be used in electronics, biomedical, pharmaceutical, cosmetic, energy, catalytic, and materials applications is amazing and the kind of research and technology that makes the United States the leader in this innovation. It is important that we continue to make this area of research a national priority.

Certainly, just as an example, look at how nanotechnology has been used to create clean, secure and affordable energy. With gas prices averaging \$4 a gallon, when was the last time we heard "affordable energy"?

Nanotechnology research is currently taking place to improve the performance or increase the efficiency of renewable energy systems, such as solar energy conversion, wind energy, biomass power for utility applications, hydrogen production and storage for transportation, including the develop-

ment of fuel cell technology, and geothermal energy. Nanofilms for windows are being developed for home use to promote energy efficiency. Nanotechnology is being used to improve batteries and create solid state lighting and low powered displays. The list and potential at this time are absolutely endless.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this measure. This has been a bipartisan effort from the beginning, and while we have made some changes to the program, I believe that, by and large, we continue to give the NNI and all the Federal agencies involved with this the flexibility that they absolutely need to do their work without being overly prescriptive.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, first let me concur with the remarks of my ranking member, Mr. HALL. This has been a good, bipartisan, collaborative effort, and I thank him and his staff for all their work.

I yield 4 minutes to the vice chairman of the Science and Technology Committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 5940, legislation reauthorizing the National Nanotechnology Initiative known as the NNI. I want to congratulate Chairman GORDON and Ranking Member HALL for their hard work in crafting this legislation. I also want to acknowledge all the members of the Science and Technology Committee on both sides of the aisle for their contributions to this bill and for helping to move it expeditiously and unanimously through the committee.

Nanotechnology, or the science and technology of building devices from single atoms and molecules, soon will impact nearly every sector of our economy. In just 6 years, the global market for nanoscale materials and products is expected to reach \$2.6 trillion and to be incorporated into 15 percent of global manufacturing output. I firmly believe that nanotech represents one of the most important, if not the most important, technological keys to improving our Nation's future economic growth and improving our way of life, from medical applications, to green nanoenergy, to nanoelectronics, which will be critical as we reach the limits of current materials.

The NNI has been effective in supporting productive, cooperative research efforts across a wide spectrum of disciplines. The initiative has established a network of state-of-the-art national facilities that are conducting groundbreaking work in nanoscale research and development. These centers have helped the U.S. maintain a strong presence in the development and expansion of nanotechnology, which has been vital to economic development and essential to the creation of innovative jobs, leading to a stronger and more competitive America. The committee stated in the bill's report lan-

guage the need to expand the current centers that we have as necessary to meet future research needs.

I am proud that my home State of Illinois is one of the leaders in nanotechnology research. Illinois boasts two national labs. It is home to numerous cutting-edge businesses and some of the Nation's preeminent research universities, such as my alma mater, Northwestern University, and the University of Illinois, which are conducting groundbreaking work in this field.

To keep the U.S. ahead of other nations, who are now making substantial investments in nanotech, this reauthorization makes three significant adjustments, as mentioned by the chairman.

First, it strengthens the planning and implementation of research on the environmental, health and safety aspects of nanotech. Not only is public safety paramount in its own right, but public confidence in these new technologies is also necessary for the success of nanotech industries.

Second, this bill requires the NNI to place increased emphasis on technology transfer; that is, moving basic research results out of the lab and into commercial products, materials and devices. From my own experiences in Illinois with our national labs and research universities, I understand that technology transfer is not simple, but it is critical to ensuring that R&D investments serve the public.

Third, H.R. 5940 creates a new nanotechnology education program to attract secondary school students to science and technology studies to help prepare the nanotech workforce of the future. As a former teacher, I understand the importance of education in promoting not only the success of individual Americans, but also promoting the success of American innovation such as nanotechnology.

Mr. Speaker, as nanotechnology moves from a multibillion to a multi-trillion-dollar industry, there is great promise in store, but it is critical that we do all we can to ensure that America leads the way in nanotech innovation. H.R. 5940 will keep the U.S. in a position to drive the development of nanotechnology and go a long way towards ensuring that America reaps the benefits of our research investment.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 5940.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), the previous Energy Subcommittee Chair.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 5940, I rise to express my continued support for the bill that we are considering here today.

Most Americans learn in grade school and high school that atoms are building blocks of nature. In the years since I was in school, incredible machines

have allowed us to even see every one of these atoms. But now, thanks to the National Nanotechnology Initiative, or NNI, we have developed and continue to develop the tools, equipment and expertise to manipulate those atoms and build new materials and new machines, one molecule at a time.

First established in 2001 and later authorized in statute in 2003, the NNI has by all accounts succeeded at coordinating nanotechnology research and development across many Federal agencies to the benefit of our national competitiveness. According to a recent review of the program by the President's Council of Advisers on Science and Technology, PCAST, the United States has been and remains the recognized leader in nanotechnology R&D. But the Council rightly pointed out that the European Union and China are gaining ground on us. That is why I am pleased that we are building on the success of NNI by passing H.R. 5940 today.

Thanks to the NNI, the U.S. has an extensive network of nanoscale science research centers. Five of those centers are operated and maintained by the Department of Energy's Office of Science. One of those DOE centers, the Center for Nanoscale Materials, is located in my district at Argonne National Laboratory.

In its first year of operation, Argonne's Center for Nanoscale Materials hosted over 100 scientists and engineers engaged in nanotech research from across the country and around the world, giving them access to the most powerful x-ray device in the Western Hemisphere at the Advanced Photon Source at Argonne.

□ 1245

As Americans face ever rising gasoline and energy prices, we are fortunate that Congress and the President had the foresight to invest in the DOE's nanoscience centers. Because of our Federal investment in years past, scientists and engineers are already hard at work manipulating atoms to create new, lighter, stronger materials for wind turbines, improved lubricants for gear boxes, and better wiring for generators, all of which will improve the efficiency of wind power. DOE scientists are also using nanotechnology to make more durable and efficient solar cells, catalysts for the direct conversion of light energy to hydrogen, new materials for lighter, more powerful, longer lasting batteries that will improve energy storage and bring the plug-in hybrid car to market more quickly. Thanks to nanotechnology, progress is being made on advanced energy technologies that will reduce our reliance on foreign oil and gas.

But to continue making progress, Congress must provide adequate funding for these critical facilities and research efforts. Unfortunately, because the fiscal year 2008 omnibus bill essentially flat funded the basic energy science program, the DOE had no

choice but to reduce the run time of scientific user facilities like the advanced photon source by 20 percent. Without a doubt, this will impact the work at the Center for Nanoscale Materials which relies on the APS.

I remain hopeful that the fiscal year 2008 supplemental working its way through Congress now will include additional funding for these important facilities and research efforts of the DOE. With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Technology Innovation, Mr. WU, from Oregon State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Tennessee that he has only 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Then I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. WU. I thank the gentleman and the chairman for his leadership on this issue and for the bipartisan manner in which this bill has come to the floor, and rise in strong support of the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008. It is very, very fitting that we are continuing efforts to support nanotechnology research and development given the economic and societal benefits that we are just beginning to realize.

Federally funded research and development has long served an important purpose in our economy, spurring the creation of new services, new products, and, most importantly, new jobs. The new products and technologies that are often the byproducts of basic research enhance our daily lives in many, many ways. It is estimated that the fruits of nanotechnology research will have a multi-trillion dollar impact on our economy within the next several years.

The bill before us today provides the seed corn for an industry that will be a crucial part of our future economic success and competitiveness. My home State of Oregon is a leader in nanotechnology. The Oregon Nanoscience and Microtechnologies Institute, ONAMI, is a public-private partnership that supports academic research and technology transfer of nanoscience. Research supported by ONAMI has already yielded companies that are developing a low-cost method of removing heavy metals to purify water, new manufacturing technologies, and a system to allow patients with kidney disease to undergo dialysis at home. Continued support of nanotechnology research allow these and other breakthrough technologies to come to market.

I want to cite a couple specific key provisions, including provisions relating to green nanotechnologies and those that encourage the commercialization of nanotechnology research.

Several institutions in the State of Oregon have been leaders in green

nanotechnology research. These funds will help these universities and others explore ways to create environmentally friendly or at least benign nanotechnology products. And this is very, very crucial to acceptance of nanotech.

In addition, there are provisions in this bill that encourage other Federal programs to support commercialization of nanotechnology research to help turn research insights into tangible useful results. Congress has already passed legislation to support programs that advance our innovation agenda, and it is fitting that nanotechnology would be funded by these programs. The relevant programs include the Technology Innovation Program, or TIP, which provides grants to companies and universities conducting high-risk, high reward research, and the Small Business Innovative Research and Small Business Technology Transfer programs, which provide funds to small high-tech firms conducting innovative research that is relevant to Federal agencies' missions and that may have significant commercialization potential.

Again, I want to commend Chairman GORDON and the ranking member for drafting a strong bipartisan bill, and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5940, the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act of 2008.

Nanotechnology represents the future of science and information technology. These scientific methods have already been responsible for a number of products that are used every day in our country, like car parts, cosmetics, and first aid dressings.

The future of nanotechnology holds a world of possibilities for a number of fields including health care, which, Mr. Speaker, is incredibly important to me as a physician member of this House.

The National Nanotechnology Initiative is a multi-agency Federal program aimed at accelerating the discovery, the development, and deployment of nanometer scale science, engineering, and technology. Since its implementation in 2003, NNI represents the Federal Government's commitment to harnessing and developing the world's most cutting edge technology to help keep our country competitive in a technologically based global economy. H.R. 5940 is a bill that builds on the successful aspects of the NNI by making some improvements and modifications while keeping much of the initiative intact. This legislation acknowledges and addresses the need for enhanced research and education in the field of nanotechnology, and it is in line with President Bush's American Competitiveness Initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that this legislation moved through the

Science and Technology Committee in a bipartisan manner so typical of our members. Unfortunately, that bipartisan spirit does not apply to the most important issue facing the American people today, and that is the price they are paying at the pump for gasoline.

Mr. Speaker, here we are 16 months after the vaunted promise of a commonsense plan to reduce energy prices by Speaker PELOSI, yet gas prices are now surpassing \$4 a gallon with no end in sight. At this point, I am not holding my breath for this commonsense plan Speaker PELOSI promised over 2 years ago. I only know the result of the plan, an increase of \$1.60 per gallon for regular gasoline. However, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that Democrats will begin working with Republicans much like they did on this bill, H.R. 5940, on our common sense plan for energy.

The Republican proposal, H.R. 3089, the No More Excuses Energy Act sponsored by my good friend Mr. THORNBERRY of Texas, will allow us to explore domestic sources of energy and will reduce the amount that we all pay at the pump. It is time for the Democrats to get serious about reducing gas prices. I call on them to join the efforts of House Republicans. Let's enact real solutions that will provide relief for our taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I am very supportive of H.R. 5940 and the possibility that nanotechnology has for the future of science. I urge all my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I come in support of this legislation, and have come to learn that this nanotechnology has great opportunities to help us in the whole energy debate. I think nanotechnology can help in the solar powered cells. I understand that nanotechnology might be able to help taking light energy and turning it into hydrogen, which is important. It can be very important in addressing the long-lasting battery issue debate which will move us to plug-in hybrids sometime in the future, which we all realize is an important aspect of what we need to do to get to energy independence. And, green nanoenergy, which is important in this whole climate debate.

I also hope that nanotechnology can address some of the other pressing scientific needs: The issue of maybe reprocessing nuclear spent fuel. Maybe taking the carbon dioxide and splitting the carbon from the oxygen and addressing the climate change so we can

use fossil fuels in a process that is going to be helpful.

But we are still in the Buck Rogers era. We need to move in that direction. The question is, what are we going to do now? The question is, at this time, in this debate, what are we really going to do to immediately affect the high cost of energy on our constituents? I have been on this floor quite a bit, as we all know, debating this. I have heard my colleagues on the other side, and I am softening my rhetoric out of respect for my friends and I have actually changed some of my charts to address issues raised in the debate.

So what is the primary problem that we have today? The problem we have is the escalation of crude oil prices in this country, from \$23 when this administration came into the office, to \$58 when the new majority came into the House, to \$123 today.

Now I am not trying to be partisan, I am just trying to be factual. That is what has happened to the barrel of crude oil prices and what has happened to the cost of gasoline. Well, it has gone up similarly in this response. So the question is, how do we address this problem if we believe in economics 101 and supply and demand?

One way we could do it is opening the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas exploration. We have legislatively put off-limits through the appropriation process a prohibition, in some areas not to even do research to see if there is any natural gas or oil there, but we have said "no" to all these areas in red, that we are telling our public we do not want to look for oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf deep sea floor exploration 50 miles off the coast. We are saying "no."

Our debate is pretty simple. At a time of high costs of a barrel of crude oil, \$123.85 a barrel, how can we not? How can we not go and look for our own resources? What we want, what we are asking for is American-made energy, American-made energy to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil in places that are not stable, in the Middle East, in Venezuela, that are holding us captive. We know there are resources there.

Let me talk about another great opportunity that we have. In Illinois, the Illinois coal basin is basically the whole geography of the State of Illinois, and of course the chairman knows a lot and is very supportive of coal use in America. It also is Western Kentucky and the southwestern part of Indiana. We have as much coal in energy output as Saudi Arabia has oil just in the Illinois coal basin. So the question is, why aren't we using it to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil? Why aren't we using coal in turning it into liquid fuel? Look at the benefits we have of coal fields: American made energy. A coal field in America, American jobs mining that coal, American jobs to build the coal to liquid refinery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank the gentleman.

American jobs to build the pipeline. American jobs to operate our aviation industry. In fact, this plane here is a fighter plane, because the United States Air Force is the number one purchaser of aviation fuel in the world.

□ 1300

For every dollar increase in a barrel of crude oil, you know what it costs our Air Force? \$60 million. That's \$60 million that doesn't go to training. That's \$60 million that doesn't go to equipping. That's \$60 million that doesn't help in meeting the budgetary demands.

Let me just finish on this point. Let's assume we access these and we have oil and gas. Or let's assume we're in ANWR and we're getting the oil and gas and we're getting the royalties. At today's prices, do you know how much money would come to the Federal Treasury at today's prices from ANWR? \$192 billion. Do you think that would help the nanotechnology budget? I think it would help extremely. Move us from a decrease in our reliance on imported crude oil, American-made energy, new science and technology, green power; and that's kind of what this debate is all about.

Mr. WU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I would be happy to yield to my friend from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Just as my friend from Illinois has modified his presentation in light of current reality, I will not, unless necessary, reprise the reason for the difference between a \$60 barrel of oil and a \$120 barrel of oil, which is the war in Iraq, rank speculation by people who can't take delivery of the oil, and low, cheap currency doctrine by this administration that has imported inflation and increased oil prices.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Reclaiming my time. But all those issues that you addressed, if we had American-made energy, if we weren't relying on imported crude oil, you know, why does the cheap dollar affect our price? Because we're buying crude oil overseas. If we were producing our own crude oil in our country, the dollar wouldn't matter.

The speculators, you know the speculators. What are they betting? I love this debate. They are betting that we're going to do nothing.

You want to go after the speculators? Bring on more supply. They're betting that this barrel is going to go up, not go down.

Mr. WU. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I would be happy to.

Mr. WU. Speculators do bet on that. Bubbles also occur in markets now. A witness to the Foreign Affairs Committee said we have 4 percent of the proven oil reserves. And yet the Republican response is, drill that 4 percent; it will solve our problems. We have 4 percent of the world's oil reserves. Drill

the reserve and that will solve our problems. The numbers are the numbers.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Let me reclaim my time, and just go over, since 1994 and talk about this debate.

In ANWR, which Clinton vetoed in 1995, we would have that oil today. House Republicans support ANWR 91 percent of the time on votes. House Democrats 86 oppose. Clear difference.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have, if any?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 1½ minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Drilling permits are up by two times in the last 5 years. But the price of gas is up by two times in the last 5 years. More permits do not bring lower prices. 10,000 more permits than wells since 2004. 92 million acres of onshore and offshore land currently under lease, but 67 million acres, over 70 percent, has not been developed by the oil and gas companies. They have a lot to work with. They're not doing it. 80 percent of the oil and gas still in the OCS is where there is no moratorium.

Now, I don't know why the gentleman, during the nanotechnology debate, nanotechnology which needs to be advanced by this country so we at least don't lose one more promising future technology, is bringing up this issue, unless he's talking about little tiny drill bits that would have less environmental impact.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Mr. SHIMKUS, the gentleman from Illinois, 1 minute.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. I want to thank the chairman for the time. With a minute left, I may not be able to yield to you, David. I would be happy to most times.

This is the problem. \$23 to \$58 to \$123. You only address that by bringing on more supply. We have oil and gas in the Outer Continental Shelf, and we need to be there.

I've got margin oil wells. I've got oil all over the State of Illinois. Do you know why we don't drill on every acre? Because you're not going to find oil on every acre.

Why are leases not put out? Because there may not be oil there. In fact, on the Outer Continental Shelf on the Atlantic coast we won't even inventory it. Last Congress we said no to inventory what we might have on the Eastern Seaboard.

All I want to do is bring down crude oil prices. The only way you do it is bringing on more supply. It's clear from the votes over the past 12 years, Republicans want to bring on more supply. Democrats, the vast majority of them, do not. All we're asking is that we have some that want to do that.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I reserve my time if the gentleman from Texas has any time left that he wants to conclude.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has half a minute.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, once again I want to thank the majority and minority members of the Science and Technology Committee for working together on this collaborative good effort.

To my friend, my passionate friend from Illinois, let me say, just as he knows that you can't turn an oil tanker around on a dime, the fact of the matter is that we can't overturn the 4 or 8 years previous nearsighted policy on a dime either. But rather than point fingers and trying to be a partisan debate here, we can work together and make some changes.

This nanotechnology bill is one more effort in helping to provide American technology for domestic production of energies of all sorts, the energies of the future, the jobs that come with that.

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5940, the National Nanotechnology Initiative Amendments Act.

I commend Chairman BART GORDON and the other members of the Science and Technology Committee, on which I am proud to have once served, for the hard work and thoughtful consideration that went into this bill. I am pleased that this bill includes numerous provisions that I originally proposed in my own legislation, the Nanotechnology Advancement and New Opportunities, NANO, Act, H.R. 3235.

Nanotechnology has the potential to create entirely new industries and radically transform the basis of competition in other fields, and I am proud of my work with former Science Committee Chairman Sherwood Boehlert on the Nanotechnology Research and Development Act of 2003 to foster research in this area.

But one of the things policymakers have heard from experts is that while the United States is a leader in nanotechnology research, our foreign competitors are focusing more resources and effort on the commercialization of those research results than we are.

Both H.R. 5940 and my own bill would focus America's nanotechnology research and development programs on areas of national need such as energy, health care, and the environment, and have provisions to help assist in the commercialization of nanotechnology.

In recent months, there has been much discussion about potential health and safety risks associated with nanotechnology. Uncertainty is one of the major obstacles to the commercialization of nanotechnology—uncertainty about what the risks might be and uncertainty about how the Federal Government might regulate nanotechnology in the future. Both my bill and H.R. 5940 require the development of a nanotechnology research plan that will ensure the development and responsible stewardship of nanotechnology.

Other important areas that are addressed by both H.R. 5940 and H.R. 3235 include: the development of curriculum tools to help improve

nanotechnology education; the establishment of educational partnerships to help prepare students to pursue postsecondary education in nanotechnology; support for the development of environmentally beneficial nanotechnology; and the development of advanced tools for simulation and characterization to enable rapid prediction, characterization and monitoring for nanoscale manufacturing.

I am also pleased that H.R. 5940 will require that the NNI Advisory Panel must be a stand-alone advisory committee. This is a concept, I originally proposed in 2002 in the Nanoscience and Nanotechnology Advisory Board Act, H.R. 5669 in the 107th Congress.

I would like to thank the members of the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Nanotechnology, BRTFN, a panel of California nanotechnology experts with backgrounds in established industry, startup companies, consulting groups, nonprofits, academia, government, medical research, and venture capital that I convened with then-California State Controller Steve Westly during 2005, for the important recommendations included in its report, Thinking Big About Thinking Small, many of which are reflected in the bill we are considering today. I would also like to thank Scott Hubbard, who was the director of the NASA Ames Research Center at that time and who served as working chair of the BRTFN, and all of the staff at Ames whose hard work made the task force run so well and helped produce a great report. The report is available on my website at http://honda.house.gov/issues/links/btrfn_report_final.pdf.

Again, I congratulate the Science and Technology Committee and Chairman GORDON for their work on this bill and thank them for incorporating so many of the provisions from my bill into H.R. 5940, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation to reauthorize the Nation's nanotechnology research and development program.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and suggest we pass this very good bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5940, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING SCIENCE EDUCATION

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 366) expressing the sense of Congress that increasing American capabilities in science, mathematics, and technology education should be a national priority.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 366

Whereas the economic competitiveness of the Nation depends on strong science, mathematics, and technology capabilities throughout the workforce;

Whereas the need for improvement in education is acute in the areas of science, mathematics, and technology;

Whereas our national competitiveness strategy must include the goals of—

(1) ensuring that all young persons achieve a level of technological literacy adequate to prepare them for the demands of a scientific and technologically oriented society; and

(2) fulfilling the need for a deep pool of talented American leaders in science and technological research and development;

Whereas numerous research reports indicate the Nation is not achieving these goals;

Whereas the most recent United States National Assessment of Educational Progress reveals that a majority of those 17 years of age are poorly equipped for informed citizenship and productive performance in the workplace;

Whereas by 2016, 35.4 percent of our workforce will be comprised of minority workers, and 46.6 percent will be women; and

Whereas women and minorities continue to be underserved by and underrepresented in science and mathematics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) this Nation should dedicate its resources to the development of a broad pool of citizens who are functionally literate in science, mathematics, and technology;

(2) a national science education policy in the coming decade should address the crucial need areas of—

(A) substantially increasing science scholarships and providing adequate financial resources to permit students from underrepresented populations to study science, mathematics, and technology; and

(B) actively involving National Science Foundation involvement in curriculum development with strong emphasis on reinforcing science and mathematics concepts at each grade level; and

(3) this national challenge can be met through strong leadership from the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy; other Federal, State, and local governments; and with long-term commitments from the civic, business, and engineering communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Concurrent Resolution 366 now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 366, expressing the sense of Congress that increasing American capabilities in science, math and technology education should be a national priority. Our Nation's youth are key to our Nation's future prosperity.

And I have schools in my district that are ranking very high; 1, 2, 3 and 4. They've been 1 and 2 and now they're 2 and 4. That's called the Townview Gifted and Talented school, ranked second in the Nation; was considered the best public school last year in the nation. And the Science and Engineer Magnet was ranked fourth this year, and it was number 2 last year by Newsweek magazine.

Townview's School of Talented and Gifted was always ranked among the best high schools in America, and this year, by the U.S. News and World Report.

In support from the high tech industry such as Texas Instruments in Dallas, as well as other local generous investors which have been critical to setting up the schools for the students' success. Unfortunately, few schools demonstrate the educational excellence of Townview, not even any more in Dallas. Congress must incentivize investments at the local level to help improve the quality of public education.

The UTeach Program, which started in Texas and headquartered at the University of Texas in Austin, is a terrific education program that places engaged, highly trained teachers in the classroom. These educators, in turn, inspire their students. Young people are learning that math and science are fun. They're learning that these subjects are important, and that they can lead to fulfilling and profitable careers.

UTeach is funded partially by generous investments from the private sector which needs these people for future employment. So we consider it an investment for them.

UTeach has tracked the success of its educational model, and it is transforming the quality of math and science education in schools that it touches. Demonstrated methods of success must be supported and expanded, and this is critical for our Nation.

Tomorrow's high-tech jobs will require a skilled workforce. Today's students are not being adequately prepared for these jobs, and it is my fear that businesses will increasingly look toward China, Taiwan, Japan and India for their workforce needs. Those nations are investing a greater percentage of their gross national product on the education of scientists, mathematicians and engineers. They're producing a large workforce of bright, young, talented individuals who work for less money than our citizens will. American companies are already hiring them. And the only solution is to produce a

better prepared work force. The root of that preparation is education. And it is too serious and too important not to give the utmost attention.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that every school could get the support and perform as well as Townview does. But my resolution expresses a sense of Congress that we must make education a much higher national priority.

A couple of years ago there was a publication by the National Academies of Science and Medicine and the National Science Foundation entitled the Rising Tide Before the Gathering Storm. Well, the gathering storm of international competition is already here, and so we must reform our public education policies, provide greater challenges to our students and give young people the tools and opportunities that they need to succeed. Our economy in this country depends on this; and we start with well-prepared teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1315

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 366. This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that increasing American capabilities in science and mathematics and technology education should be a national priority, and I couldn't agree more. I gladly support the gentlelady from Texas's resolution.

The Science Committee recognized a few years ago that this Nation needed to make American capabilities in STEM education a priority. Our current chairman, Mr. GORDON, along with then-Chairman Sherry Boehlert requested the report that was to become the "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report to which we have so often referred in this Congress. As a result of this report, the President came out with his American Competitive Initiative; and this Congress passed, and the President signed, the America COMPETES Act, which specifically addresses the concerns raised in this resolution.

In COMPETES, we're dedicating resources to create a broad pool of citizens who are literate in STEM subjects and we are increasing science scholarships and providing financial resources to attract underrepresented populations to STEM fields. Likewise, NSF is funding tremendous STEM education curriculum work in all grades, and OSTP and other Federal agencies, like the Department of Education, are providing strong leadership as appropriate at the Federal level.

A few weeks ago, I held a hearing in Texarkana, Texas at the Martha and Josh Morriss Mathematics and Engineering Elementary School, a 100 percent locally funded public school that focuses on inspiring our young children to excel in math and science at an early age and hopefully keep them interested all the way through college.

This school is a prime example of the kind of leadership and commitment necessary at the local level and included input from several groups, businesses, the academic community, and parents.

However, there is always room for improvement, and we should strive to do more. In fact, it's imperative that we do more if we're to remain the world leader in innovation and technology.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution introduced by my good friend, Ms. JOHNSON.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution and commend my colleague, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for introducing it and the chairman of the Science Committee for bringing it forward.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that increasing American capabilities in science, mathematics, and technology education should be a national priority. And I must say, I hope Members on the other side of this aisle will avoid distracting us with red herrings across the trail and debating other diverting matters such as drilling and digging in the United States and stick to this topic which is of critical importance.

Since first coming to Congress almost a decade ago, I stressed the need for a new major national effort to improve science, mathematics, and technology education. I'm a product of the science revolution in the United States that occurred following the launch of Sputnik in 1957. And today, as this resolution notes, we must recommit ourselves to creating a new generation of scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, and just as important, indeed more important, we need to build a general public that is literate and comfortable with science, math, technology.

I would ask at this point to include in the RECORD a copy of a recent op-ed essay entitled "Put a Little Science in Your Life" by Brian Greene, professor of physics at Columbia and author of *The Elegant Universe*. He discusses the importance of science in everyone's lives, not just scientists.

[From the New York Times, June 1, 2008]

PUT A LITTLE SCIENCE IN YOUR LIFE

(By Brian Greene)

A couple of years ago I received a letter from an American soldier in Iraq. The letter began by saying that, as we've all become painfully aware, serving on the front lines is physically exhausting and emotionally debilitating. But the reason for his writing was to tell me that in that hostile and lonely environment, a book I'd written had become a kind of lifeline. As the book is about science—one that traces physicists' search for nature's deepest laws—the soldier's letter might strike you as, well, odd.

But it's not. Rather, it speaks to the powerful role science can play in giving life con-

text and meaning. At the same time, the soldier's letter emphasized something I've increasingly come to believe: our educational system fails to teach science in a way that allows students to integrate it into their lives.

Allow me a moment to explain.

When we consider the ubiquity of cellphones, iPods, personal computers and the Internet, it's easy to see how science (and the technology to which it leads) is woven into the fabric of our day-to-day activities. When we benefit from CT scanners, M.R.I. devices, pacemakers and arterial stents, we can immediately appreciate how science affects the quality of our lives. When we assess the state of the world, and identify looming challenges like climate change, global pandemics, security threats and diminishing resources, we don't hesitate in turning to science to gauge the problems and find solutions.

And when we look at the wealth of opportunities hovering on the horizon—stem cells, genomic sequencing, personalized medicine, longevity research, nanoscience, brain-machine interface, quantum computers, space technology—we realize how crucial it is to cultivate a general public that can engage with scientific issues; there's simply no other way that as a society we will be prepared to make informed decisions on a range of issues that will shape the future.

These are the standard—and enormously important—reasons many would give in explaining why science matters.

But here's the thing. The reason science really matters runs deeper still. Science is a way of life. Science is a perspective. Science is the process that takes us from confusion to understanding in a manner that's precise, predictive and reliable—a transformation, for those lucky enough to experience it, that is empowering and emotional. To be able to think through and grasp explanations—for everything from why the sky is blue to how life formed on earth—not because they are declared dogma but rather because they reveal patterns confirmed by experiment and observation, is one of the most precious of human experiences.

As a practicing scientist, I know this from my own work and study. But I also know that you don't have to be a scientist for science to be transformative. I've seen children's eyes light up as I've told them about black holes and the Big Bang. I've spoken with high school dropouts who've stumbled on popular science books about the human genome project, and then returned to school with newfound purpose. And in that letter from Iraq, the soldier told me how learning about relativity and quantum physics in the dusty and dangerous environs of greater Baghdad kept him going because it revealed a deeper reality of which we're all a part.

It's striking that science is still widely viewed as merely a subject one studies in the classroom or an isolated body of largely esoteric knowledge that sometimes shows up in the "real" world in the form of technological or medical advances. In reality, science is a language of hope and inspiration, providing discoveries that fire the imagination and instill a sense of connection to our lives and our world.

If science isn't your strong suit—and for many it's not—this side of science is something you may have rarely if ever experienced. I've spoken with so many people over the years whose encounters with science in school left them thinking of it as cold, distant and intimidating. They happily use the innovations that science makes possible, but feel that the science itself is just not relevant to their lives. What a shame.

Like a life without music, art or literature, a life without science is bereft of

something that gives experience a rich and otherwise inaccessible dimension.

It's one thing to go outside on a crisp, clear night and marvel at a sky full of stars. It's another to marvel not only at the spectacle but to recognize that those stars are the result of exceedingly ordered conditions 13.7 billion years ago at the moment of the Big Bang. It's another still to understand how those stars act as nuclear furnaces that supply the universe with carbon, oxygen and nitrogen, the raw material of life as we know it.

And it's yet another level of experience to realize that those stars account for less than 4 percent of what's out there—the rest being of an unknown composition, so-called dark matter and energy, which researchers are now vigorously trying to divine.

As every parent knows, children begin life as uninhibited, unabashed explorers of the unknown. From the time we can walk and talk, we want to know what things are and how they work—we begin life as little scientists. But most of us quickly lose our intrinsic scientific passion. And it's a profound loss.

A great many studies have focused on this problem, identifying important opportunities for improving science education. Recommendations have ranged from increasing the level of training for science teachers to curriculum reforms.

But most of these studies (and their suggestions) avoid an overarching systemic issue: in teaching our students, we continually fail to activate rich opportunities for revealing the breathtaking vistas opened up by science, and instead focus on the need to gain competency with science's underlying technical details.

In fact, many students I've spoken to have little sense of the big questions those technical details collectively try to answer: Where did the universe come from? How did life originate? How does the brain give rise to consciousness? Like a music curriculum that requires its students to practice scales while rarely if ever inspiring them by playing the great masterpieces, this way of teaching science squanders the chance to make students sit up in their chairs and say, "Wow, that's science?"

In physics, just to give a sense of the raw material that's available to be leveraged, the most revolutionary of advances have happened in the last 100 years—special relativity, general relativity, quantum mechanics—a symphony of discoveries that changed our conception of reality. More recently, the last 10 years have witnessed an upheaval in our understanding of the universe's composition, yielding a wholly new prediction for what the cosmos will be like in the far future.

These are paradigm-shaking developments. But rare is the high school class, and rarer still is the middle school class, in which these breakthroughs are introduced. It's much the same story in classes for biology, chemistry and mathematics.

At the root of this pedagogical approach is a firm belief in the vertical nature of science: you must master A before moving on to B. When A happened a few hundred years ago, it's a long climb to the modern era. Certainly, when it comes to teaching the technicalities—solving this equation, balancing that reaction, grasping the discrete parts of the cell—the verticality of science is unassailable.

But science is so much more than its technical details. And with careful attention to presentation, cutting-edge insights and discoveries can be clearly and faithfully communicated to students independent of those details; in fact, those insights and discoveries are precisely the ones that can drive a

young student to want to learn the details. We rob science education of life when we focus solely on results and seek to train students to solve problems and recite facts without a commensurate emphasis on transporting them out beyond the stars.

Science is the greatest of all adventure stories, one that's been unfolding for thousands of years as we have sought to understand ourselves and our surroundings. Science needs to be taught to the young and communicated to the mature in a manner that captures this drama. We must embark on a cultural shift that places science in its rightful place alongside music, art and literature as an indispensable part of what makes life worth living.

It's the birthright of every child, it's a necessity for every adult, to look out on the world, as the soldier in Iraq did, and see that the wonder of the cosmos transcends everything that divides us.

There is no denying that America is losing ground and global competitiveness to countries that are making the necessary investments in education and research and development. We owe our current economic strength, our current national security, our current quality of life, to the investments of past generations.

However, the Federal Government has failed to fund adequately research, development, and innovation. Investment in these areas ensures that American people will continue to benefit from opportunities of the rapidly growing global economy and its inherent foundations.

In August of 2007, this body passed into law, as my colleague from Texas pointed out, a comprehensive competitiveness package, the America COMPETES Act, which was based on disturbing findings of the National Academies' report, "Rising Above the Gathering Storm," that our Nation is severely underinvesting in engineering and the physical sciences.

Unfortunately, the fiscal year 2008 budget fell short of the required goal. Without taking a bold, different approach in this year's appropriation cycle, Congress will be delivering a blow to our future economic security and competitiveness.

I thank gentlelady for introducing this legislation. I hope we pay heed.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I apologize to my friend from New Jersey because, if we are not talking about the number one issue in America on the floor of the House, then what are we here for? Science and technology is critical to decrease our reliance on imported crude oil. Science and technology will bring us to a new era where we don't have to rely on the energy supplies of the past. So I concur, and I support this resolution, and I'm glad people are debating it.

But you know what the people in America are debating. You know it. Everybody was home during the last 10 days. They're talking about this, and this is what we ought to be doing. You mentioned in your discussion that we

don't have the funds. Well, if we went into ANWR, which is the size of the State of South Carolina and had a drilling path that formed the size of Dulles Airport or a football field and put a postage stamp on that, we've got the revenues. Just with the royalties from ANWR we could fund science and technology. In fact, we're going to have a resources bill on the floor that's going to address at least the pay-for, which was a method to address Mr. DEFAZIO's issue on leases.

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. Yes, I will.

So we're willing to talk about this, but golly, if we're not talking about energy and the price of gasoline at the pump, then what are we doing?

Mr. HOLT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHIMKUS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLT. Quite simply, the reason gasoline prices are so high today—of course there is international speculation—is there's demand from other countries; there's the falling value of the dollar. Principally, it is because, in past decades, we failed to wean ourselves from fossil fuels. We have failed to make the investment in research and development that would make that possible. You're talking about drilling in Alaska.

Mr. SHIMKUS. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. HOLT. If I may continue.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Yes, you may. I'm just going to debate.

If we had the resources from the royalties on oil and gas exploration in the outer continental shelf or if we had the resources from the royalties from ANWR, we would have the money to be able to segue into a national debate on solar, on wind, on biotechnology, on the nanotechnology. There is a whole pot of money out there. A lot of people in America think that we have no fossil fuels, no energy resources left in this country. So this is the problem. I mean you kind of identified it, but when a barrel of crude oil is \$23 in January 2001 and in January 2006 it goes up double and now it's up double again, that's the problem.

We have to have a long-term and a short-term strategy. Our debate is the science and technology. That's a long-term debate. But what do we do about easing the cost of the high food prices, which is in direct correlation to energy costs? We're talking about schools. What is the number one problem in schools today? Diesel prices for school buses has doubled. Energy costs for heating and cooling are doubling. That goes to the local taxpayer. So we ought to be talking about this.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOLT. It's the wrong argument. We are here to talk about the future that we will get from investment in research and development.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Reclaiming my time, we want to talk about the future, but

what our constituents are talking about is the present. There has been more than \$1.68 increase in gasoline prices. How can we even send our kids to the university if energy costs have doubled? We should have both debates, and we should not be afraid to talk about how to get out of this problem.

Mr. HOLT. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HOLT. We will not get out of this problem by doing more of the same that we have been doing.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Reclaiming my time, you all want to do no exploration, no gas, no coal, no nuclear, which brings costs up. We're saying let's bring on more supply. Let's mitigate the cost. Let's plan for the future. We are talking about now. We are not talking about 30, 40 years from now. We need to talk about that debate. Your committee is a great committee to talk about the future, but we have got \$123 a barrel of crude oil today. No nanotechnology, no recognizing science and education is going to bring that cost down.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to Mr. LIPINSKI from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution that we are right now talking about on the floor, and I want to commend my colleague from Texas for introducing this legislation. My constituents certainly understand that we need to both look at problems that are facing us right now, today, and also we need to plan for the future or else we wind up in situations like we're facing today.

As vice chairman of the House Science and Technology Committee, as well as a former college professor and engineer and husband of a credentialed actuary, I became aware of the need to invest in STEM education for young Americans. Providing high-quality jobs for hardworking Americans must be our top priority. In order to accomplish that, we must be proactive.

The necessary first step is an improved STEM education in schools because an educated workforce is the foundation for economic strength. For generations, science and engineering have been the base of America's economic growth. We were leaders in the industrial revolution, and we initiated the Internet age. Today, these fields continue to have great potential for growing our economy and employing more Americans.

Between 1983 and 2004, the percentage of the U.S. workforce in science and engineering occupations almost doubled. Ground-breaking discoveries in innovative technologies are continually creating new industries and opportunities. Nanotechnology, which we just discussed in the reauthorization of the NNI, is just one of the many exciting industries that are revolutionizing the international economy.

However, if we are not careful, America will be left behind in future technological revolutions. This fact was highlighted nationally when the National Academy of Sciences released its "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" report which emphasized the need for the government to improve science, technology, engineering, and math for STEM education. In the 110th Congress, we confronted this challenge head on by enacting the America COMPETES Act. But additional measures to improve our global standing are still needed.

The resolution before us today will assist the United States in dedicating its resources to the STEM field and in promoting science education policy by educating a broad pool of Americans in these critically important fields. These areas are vital to America's economic competitiveness, and this resolution will help to ensure a vital future for next generation of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, we have challenges ahead of us, but the American people have always succeeded in conquering their greatest challenges. With this resolution, we will get that and ensure that all American students receive the skills and knowledge required for success in the 21st century workforce.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution to plan for the future and plan for a brighter future for America. This resolution helps us to do that.

□ 1330

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may use, subject to the amount of time I have left. Could you tell me how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 12½ minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the Speaker.

The gentleman from New Jersey keeps talking about doing away with fossil fuels. You know, that's just almost laughable. You do away with fossil fuels today, a year from today, 2 years from today, 5 years from today, 10 years from today, turn these lights out, cut out your air conditioners, forget about driving up to anywhere to get gasoline or oil, forget about building the roads, heating and cooling, just shut her all down, forget about it, and forget about that 40 percent we get from a Nation that doesn't trust us, Saudi Arabia, that's all fossil fuels. We have no control over them.

Sure, we ought to have technology to address fossil fuels to make it cleaner, but we're whistling Dixie if we think we're going to do away and do without fossil fuels.

It's easy to condemn and not trust the oil and gas people, but without them, we wouldn't have the lights we're using right today. We wouldn't have the gasoline that's in our cars, the money that it takes to build asphalt roads, and I could go on down the list forever.

Where do you think 40 percent of that comes from? Saudi Arabia. Another 20 percent from other Arab Nations just like Saudi Arabia that don't trust us and we don't trust them. That's what it's all about. We can't do without fossil fuels. That's foolishness.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's high-time that we realize that we have to work together and seek technology to lessen the effect of carbons and be sensible about it, be reasonable about it, but we can't just shut this off and condemn those that are producing, the men and women in the oil industry that are producing the lights that we share today and cleaning the air that we have today.

We need to keep looking for technology to make it better and cleaner, but it's foolish to talk about doing away with it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) to have as much time as he may consume to speak on this issue.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady for her generous grant of time.

There might be some small grounds for agreement here. I did hear both the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from New Jersey, and particularly the gentleman from Illinois, in talking in support of the legislation that's actually before us, which does not pertain to gas and oil prices or supply in any way, saying we needed and he supported the idea of research, investment, and education, and moving toward new technologies.

The gentleman from New Jersey talked about a transition from a petroleum-based economy. I think there's some grounds, small grounds, for agreement there.

But I guess, and I think most American people would agree with that, they know we can't, you know, drill big and burn our way out of this problem. We've got to cut our dependence to OPEC and other foreign sources of oil, and we've got to mitigate the damage on our economy.

But then that's where the disagreement starts because mitigating the damage to consumers today means taking some tough votes in this House of Representatives. One tough one was May 20 of last year, rollcall 332. Now, that seemed a no-brainer to me, but it was really tough on the Republican side, and the gentleman from Illinois voted against it.

It was to have the Justice Department, United States Justice Department, investigate collusion by the OPEC Nations to unnecessarily constrain supply and drive up the price for American consumers. That was a tough vote for the gentleman from Illinois. He voted "no." He didn't think the Justice Department should investigate. I also have a bill saying the President should file a complaint against the OPEC countries in the WTO.

You know, the Bush administration, in fact, is now investigating collusion

by OPEC. They still haven't filed a complaint in the WTO. So the Bush administration is taking a step that the gentleman from Illinois opposed, investigating collusion which is gouging consumers. We need a new energy future, but we don't need to allow our consumers to be price gouged on the way there.

Mr. WU raised another issue which the gentleman just brushed off, which is the whole issue that credible analysts say, because of the Enron loophole—remember, Ken Boy? He might be dead but his memory lives on, and about 50 cents a gallon for the American people. Ken Boy Lay of Enron, one of the President's best buddies, got a special loophole from this Republican Congress deregulating derivatives in energy trading so that they could speculate. Well, he's dead, Enron's bankrupt, but the speculation is rampant.

And experts tell us probably 50 cents on every gallon, 50 cents on every gallon today, you want to give immediate relief, reregulate the commodities market. You're not regulating the price of gas. You're just saying you can't have derivatives and you can't have Morgan Stanley holding more futures contracts and more fuel than ExxonMobil. Just reregulate the market. They can't self-deal. Just reregulate the market. Just bring some regular trading back to that market that existed before 2000. You could save tomorrow 50 cents a gallon.

Now, you can talk about ANWR, and he talked about it with great certainty. I've been sitting in on debates for 20 years over ANWR. One well was drilled. What was there we don't know. It was proprietary. There are estimates from a little bit to a lot of oil. But he knows exactly how much is there, interesting, and how much revenue it would bring, even more interesting, since right now oil from Alaska can and is being exported from the United States of America. I guess he's worried about the Chinese energy problem because that's most likely where any additional supply from Alaska would go until we develop more refinery capacity, which the industry refuses to do. And there are ways to drive them to make that investment, but the gentleman doesn't support that legislation either, which I've introduced.

So we're hearing a lot of bloviating and talk on that side of the aisle because Republicans are running scared because their coffers have been filled by this industry for years and they were put into power and Bush was put into the White House and DICK CHENEY was put into the Vice President's mansion by this industry. And this industry is kind of unpopular right now.

So they want to pretend they want to do something 10, 15, 20 years out. Let's even bring it a little closer in. The gentleman again talked about ANWR. Well, right just a little way away from ANWR, guess what, there's something Bill Clinton leased called the Naval Petroleum Reserve. We know there's oil

under that. Bill Clinton leased it. Bill Clinton's been gone seven-and-a-half years. How time flies.

How many producing wells are there in the Naval Petroleum Reserve drilled by American companies who have leased that reserve? None, not one, not a single one.

So, if the need is to get more production going in Alaska, how about they drill the wells in the Naval Petroleum Reserve where we know there's oil as opposed to pretending there might be oil in ANWR, and we could drill way over there, and it's also a lot further from the existing pipeline and other shipping capabilities.

So there's a heck of a lot of stuff, as I said earlier in my 45-second response—I regret I didn't have time at that point to yield to the gentleman. He's not here now. I would have given him at least 30 seconds—to develop out there, but the industry isn't developing it. Ten thousand permits that haven't been actuated, and they start talking about Illinois.

These Federal leases aren't in Illinois. I'm not aware of any Federal leases in Illinois for oil exploration. These are off the coast where 80 percent of the supply is accessible through existing leases. The industry just hasn't seen fit to develop it. Why not? Because it's working really well for them right now. Record prices. They don't really care about supply. They sure as heck don't want more supply to bring down the price.

Plain and simple, they're extorting the American people. They're extorting through collusion with OPEC. They're extorting through speculation in the energy markets, and they're extorting by withholding their drilling from leases they already have while pretending they need more. Plain and simple, it's a scam.

And I'm really disappointed that the gentleman is going to oppose my bill later when he talks about all the revenue that could be realized, when right now royalty-free oil is flowing out of the gulf because of a bureaucratic error, and he doesn't want to fix that problem because he thinks the oil companies need the money more than my counties and schools, and we'll hear more about that later.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) 3 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate the comments that have been made so far. I'm reminded by President Reagan, who once said there you go again, and some of those statements can apply here.

But one statement was they aren't accurate, but what we are talking about here in this part of the discussion deals with how real people are impacted in their daily lives.

We no longer are talking about energy consumption as an ethereal process or whether it meets different needs, kind of a policy concept. We're talking about how people, real people, bake

their food, heat their homes, and how they keep their jobs.

For every dollar that there is an increase in oil prices and gasoline prices, it simply means that jobs are lost, that revenue does not flow here. Social Security programs are diminished, and the overall quality of life is diminished. We're talking about real people and how real people are impacted.

For every dollar a poor person or a middle-income person has to spend on increased energy consumption, that's a dollar they cannot spend on luxuries like tuna casserole. This is what we're talking about. If you're extremely rich, you can try and buy your way out of it like an old medieval duke buying indulgences from the Catholic church. But for middle-income people and poor people, we are talking about how they live their lives, and we're talking about a country that has more energy potential locked up than other Nations have in their entire countries.

That's the concept that is here, and yet we always come back to picky little reasons why we can't develop the source, renew that source or build on that particular source as well.

We can't develop in ANWR because even though the Carter administration set this particular piece of property aside for energy development because it offends somebody. We can't have windmills off the coast of Massachusetts; it doesn't look right. We can't drill off the coast of Florida because it might offend the tourists someday.

We all have picky little reasons on why we can't do it, and the net product is we harm our own people because we don't have a policy that provides a positive reinforced policy, a strong program that will encourage conservation but also encourage production of every source of resources that we have at our disposal.

It has to happen and it has to happen now because we're dealing with real people.

We're also dealing with the security of this country. Early on this floor, they talked about an element of section 526 that was passed in the energy bill which simply had the proposal of cutting out the needs of our military in their advancement for alternative synthetic fuels. That's one of the things we're looking at. Five years ago, it cost us \$2 billion a year for petroleum for our military. Today, we're talking about \$12 billion a year. We cannot do that any longer. Those are the issues we have to have.

We have to realize that what we're talking about is real people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Who we are hurting are real people, and those people who are in the middle income and those people who are on the edges of our society and those people on fixed incomes, which is about 45 million Americans, those are the ones who get hurt first.

And the more we talk about the philosophy, what should or should not be done, and the later we decide to take as our policy statement that we will become energy secure and energy independent and we will develop all the resources we have at our disposal to become energy independent, that's when we actually decide to try and help people.

I thank the Speaker for his indulgences.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. We reserve the balance.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 7 minutes.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) 3 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. I rise today to agree with the resolution, but the real substance of the debate on the House floor today should be about gas prices. That is the substance of what we should be talking about as a people because I know my constituents are talking about it. They commute to work each day and pay and pay and pay high gas prices every day. And it is because this Congress hasn't acted.

Now, certainly the resolution calling for more math and science students, that's well and good, but what we should be talking about right now is how we're going to become energy independent as Americans, how we use American resources, whether it's natural gas, petroleum products, energy research, how are we going to invest in those things now.

This Congress, this Democrat leadership has failed to act, and I think that's irresponsible.

□ 1345

You know, one answer that they say is conservation. That's what some on the other side of the aisle say is the answer. And, you know, conservation is a sign of personal virtue, but we cannot conserve our way to energy independence, American energy independence.

So what do we do? Well, I believe we have to use our technology and our innovation here in the United States to become energy independent. We have vast resources, whether it's oil shale in the Rocky Mountain west, whether it's tar sands in our neighboring Canada, in order to harvest oil out of those areas. We must do it, though. The American people are paying close to \$4 at the pumps, and that's unacceptable. And I think, beyond that, when it comes to energy, we need an American solution, an America that relies on its own ingenuity and innovation, not beholden to the Saudi royal family.

I call on this Congress to act, to streamline the regulation process so we can get new refineries online, to open up new areas of exploration. That's what we should be doing, not simply debating this resolution, but working on real, substantive issues the American people need and desire.

My constituents in western North Carolina demand action when it comes to lowering gas prices. And this Congress can do something about it, but we have to open up new areas of exploration, we have to increase refining capacity, and we have to invest in renewable energy sources that are clean, efficient, and American solutions that make us self-reliant.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I would like to yield 2½ minutes to Mr. DEFAZIO to respond to the last presenter.

Mr. DEFAZIO. There are 36.9 billion reasons why we aren't doing more to protect consumers today, why we haven't filed the complaints against OPEC, why the Republicans voted against investigating collusion by OPEC, why the Republicans created loopholes in energy trading so that Enron could get rich—well, they went bankrupt, actually, but others can speculate in the market, driving up gas 50 cents a gallon today. And they don't want to close that loophole because their rich buddies benefit from it, just like their rich buddies in the oil industry benefit from the lack of supply.

But I was shocked to hear the gentleman talk about needing to loosen up regulations in order to get more refinery capacity. A few years ago, George Bush offered to let any oil company that wanted to build a new refinery build it on a closed military base and waive all the environmental laws. How many takers did he get? Big goose egg, zero, none.

What did the head of Exxon Mobil say just 2 weeks ago? We're not interested in building refineries; we're doing just fine the way things are. They are restraining, and they have restrained over the last decade, refinery capacity in collusion to drive up the price. It's yet another excuse to drive up the price.

So they don't want to build refineries and give relief to the American consumers. They don't want us to take on the collusion of OPEC because they're making money off of it. They don't want us to stop the speculation in the commodities market because Big Oil and big Wall Street are making money off it.

And then they want to shift to this fatuous debate about ANWR. They know exactly how much oil is there, unlike anybody else in the world except the one company that drilled the one proprietary well 25 years ago, they're the only people who know if there is or isn't anything there. But we do know underneath the former National Petroleum Reserve, set aside by a much more far-sighted administration 70 years ago, there is a sea of oil underneath the National Petroleum Reserve. And Bill Clinton leased that to the oil industry because they were

carping about the need for new places to go and drill for oil. Bill Clinton has been gone 7½ years. How many producing wells are there in the Naval Petroleum Reserve? Goose egg, zero, same as the number of new refineries, goose egg, zero, because they're making huge profits the way it is. Why should they give relief to the American consumers because relief means lower extortionate profits for them. They have no intention of giving relief to the American people. This is a red herring.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I appreciate the opportunity to respond to my colleague and his utter fabrication about the history.

Now, talk about rewriting history here; instead of complaining about the problem, we're offering solutions. And I'm proud that I'm part of the solution. And that solution is to hold the oil companies accountable. That's right, the gentleman is right about that. But I think we have to go a step further. We have to make sure that refineries can get online. The reason why they won't build new refineries is that regulation that this Congress supports, the trial lawyers as well, and the extreme environmental community that fund the left, and my colleagues on the left, they're all about shutting down new refinery capacity.

Beyond that, my colleague that just spoke is not for any exploration in this country whatsoever. And the American people know this, Mr. Speaker. The American people know that we need more supply of energy, and that will bring prices lower, not this rewriting of history that my colleague just issued.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman to respond, Mr. DEFAZIO.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentlelady.

First off, it was the head of ExxonMobil, the most profitable industry in the history of the world, who said he has no intention of building a refinery. He didn't mention regulations or bureaucracy. He said they're doing just fine the way it is, why would they build another refinery? And other CEOs of oil companies have said the same thing.

It's not bureaucracy or regulation. They didn't take Bush up on his loophole to put it on closed military bases. So that's not the issue. Don't try that stuff.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The gentleman from Oregon is a very good speaker and knowledgeable. He's been here a long, long time. He said there are a thousand reasons why we're out of energy and why we're in the situation we're in. I will say maybe there's two less. You just take these two, though, out of that thousand, I don't know how many he has left. But

when we talk about who's furnishing fossil fuels, and who's furnishing nuclear energy, who's furnishing clean coal, who's furnishing solar. And no one has objected to this or no one has said it's not so, 91 percent of the House Republicans have historically voted to increase the production of American-made oil and gas, while 86 percent of the House Democrats have historically voted against increasing the production of American-made oil and gas. I don't know where the other thousand are, but that's the major reason we're where we are today.

They don't want to drill here. They won't let us drill off the coast of Florida. They don't want to drill up in ANWR. Let me tell you something, we better be drilling on American soil or we're going to have to send our American boys to take some energy away from someone. And that would be an absolute crime when we have plenty right here at home. It's a shame we don't use our own.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that what we're really discussing is the House Concurrent Resolution 366, making science and math and technology education a priority. And I now would like to ask my colleagues to support and pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 366.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a concurrent resolution on the House of the following title.

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2162. An act to improve the treatment and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder and substance use disorders, and for other purposes.

S. 2967. An act to provide for certain Federal employee benefits to be continued for certain employees of the Senate Restaurants after operations of the Senate Restaurants are contracted to be performed by a private business concern, and for other purposes.

RECOGNIZING OUTSTANDING
WOMEN SCIENTISTS, TECH-
NOLOGISTS, ENGINEERS, AND
MATHEMATICIANS ON MOTHER'S
DAY, 2008

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1180) recognizing the efforts and contributions of outstanding women scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians in the United States and around the world on Mother's Day, 2008, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1180

Whereas women have been vitally important to the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and have transformed the world and enhanced and improved the quality of life around the globe;

Whereas the contributions of women are central to progress and to the development of knowledge in many areas, including chemistry, physics, biology, geology, engineering, mathematics, and astronomy, and these contributions boost economic growth, create new jobs, and improve our knowledge and standard of living;

Whereas there is a need to congratulate these women, educate the public about the important role of women in society, and recognize the contributions of women to the scientific, technological, engineering, and mathematical communities;

Whereas it is important to emphasize the extensive variety of careers available in the world of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and to honor the tremendous women that have contributed and will contribute to the advancement of knowledge in these disciplines;

Whereas in order to ensure our Nation's global competitiveness, our schools must continue to cultivate female scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians from every background and neighborhood in our society to create the innovations of tomorrow that will keep our Nation strong;

Whereas a disproportionately low number of female students are pursuing careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and it is crucial that we focus attention on increasing the participation of women; and

Whereas there is a need to encourage industry, government, and academia to reach and educate millions of children on the important contributions women have made to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the important contributions of women to science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and the health of many industries that have created new jobs, boosted economic growth, and improved the Nation's competitiveness and standard of living;

(2) recognizes the need to increase the number of women participating in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics;

(3) supports the role of women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; and

(4) encourages the people of the United States to give appropriate recognition to women scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians who have made important contributions to our everyday lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 1180, the resolution now under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of House Resolution 1180, recognizing the efforts and contributions of outstanding women scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians in the United States and around the world.

In its 2007 Beyond Bias and Barriers report, the National Academy stated that in order to maintain its scientific and engineering leadership and increasing economic and educational globalization the United States must aggressively pursue the innovative capacity of all of its people, men and women.

While women have made substantial progress in some fields, such as the life sciences, they continue to be significantly underrepresented in other STEM fields such as engineering and computer science. The attrition rate remains higher for women than for men at all steps along the STEM pipeline. In fact, studies have shown that girls as young as middle school age are being turned away from many STEM fields.

There is no evidence that the gender gap is caused by a lack of female talent or potential. In fact, the top three winners in the highly prestigious 2007 Siemens Competition in Math, Science and Technology and the first prize in the 2008 Intel Talent Search all went to young high school women.

We are failing our young girls and women, and neither our colleges and universities nor our industries can afford such a loss of precious human capital in science and engineering. We can't make it with just 50 percent of the Nation's brain power.

I applaud the gentleman from Washington for introducing this resolution. It is fitting to recognize the efforts and contributions of outstanding women scientists and engineers and mathematicians in the United States and around the world, and I ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 1180.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the National Science Foundation, a recent study of fourth graders showed that 66 percent of the girls and 68 percent of boys reported that they liked science. But something else starts happening in the elementary school. NSF found that by the eighth grade, boys are twice as interested in STEM careers as girls are. The female attrition continues through high school, college, and even the workforce.

Women with STEM higher education degrees are twice as likely to leave a scientific or engineering job as men with comparable STEM degrees. Despite the fact that women earn half of the bachelors degrees in science and engineering, they continue to be significantly underrepresented at the faculty level in almost all the S&E fields, constituting 28 percent in 2003 of doctoral science and engineering faculty in 4-year colleges and universities and only 18 percent of full professors.

The Commission on the Advancement of Women and Minorities in Science, Engineering and Technology Development was established by Congress on October 14, 1988 through legislation developed and sponsored by Congresswoman Connie Morella, Republican from Maryland. The mandate of the Commission is to research and recommend ways to improve the recruitment, the retention, and the representation of women, underrepresented minorities, and persons with disabilities in science, engineering, and technology education and employment.

In addition to the Commission, the NSF Research on Gender in Science and Engineering program has worked since 1993 to broaden the participation of girls and women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education fields.

One of the things research has discovered is that the more positive images you present of women in these fields in school, the more likely girls will want to enter into these fields later on in life.

So the resolution before us today honors the contribution of women in the fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, both in the United States and around the world. It also allows us to thank women for the contribution that they have made to these fields, women such as Madelaine Barnothey, the first woman in Hungary to receive a Ph.D. specializing in physics; or Rosalind Franklin, who received her degree in chemistry in 1951 from Cambridge University and was instrumental in putting together a detailed description of DNA; or Sophia Germain, an outstanding mathematician who developed the modern theory of elasticity, without which modern construction would be absolutely impossible.

Women have been pioneers in the field of science, technology, engineering and mathematics for centuries.

□ 1400

We owe it to girls growing up today to recognize these accomplishments,

accomplishments such as those of Maria Telkes, who was a physicist and pioneer in solar energy and designed and built a solar house in the 1930s; or those of Admiral Grace Murray Hopper, who was buried at Arlington Cemetery in January, 1992, and was one of the very first software engineers who helped both the military, private sector, and academia develop the foundations of modern digital computing.

We just can't discuss important women in history without recognizing the outstanding contributions of Marie Curie, a physicist and chemist, who is one of the only people to ever receive two Nobel prizes in different fields and the only woman to have won two Nobel prizes. Her Nobel prizes were awarded for her work on radioactivity and the discovery of the elements of polonium and radium.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the resolution before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me thank Mr. HALL for supporting this legislation and thank the gentleman who sponsored it. And I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that he mentioned Ms. Connie Morella, whom I worked with from the time I arrived until she left on this very subject. And I hope that we are gaining more and more support to encourage our young women to stay involved in these STEM programs and recognize our achievers so that they can know that they are great examples.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, I am the proud sponsor of House Resolution 1180, which recognizes the important contributions of women to science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and the health of many industries that have created new jobs, boosted economic growth, and improved our Nation's competitiveness.

Congress must continue to educate the public about the important role of women in society and recognize the key accomplishments of women in scientific fields. Furthermore, we must encourage more young women to pursue careers in science and technology fields by adequately funding STEM education in our schools.

Much is being done in the Pacific Northwest to achieve these goals. Seattle's Pacific Science Center remains an educational force in our region and continues to inspire students' interest in science. Similarly, the Museum of Flight recognizes the success of female aviation pioneers and helps young women discover career possibilities in the world of aerospace.

I am pleased that the Science and Technology Committee quickly brought this measure to the floor in a bipartisan manner, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1180, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution recognizing the efforts and contributions of outstanding women scientists, technologists, engineers, and mathematicians in the United States and around the world."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LAND COMMUNITIES TRANSITION ACT OF 2008

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3058) to amend chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, to provide full payments under such chapter to units of general local government in which entitlement land is located, to provide transitional payments during fiscal years 2008 through 2012 to those States and counties previously entitled to payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3058

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Public Land Communities Transition Act of 2008".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Transitional payments States and counties previously entitled to payments under Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.
- Sec. 3. Special requirements regarding transition payments to certain States.
- Sec. 4. Conservation of resources fees.
- Sec. 5. Sense of Congress on distribution of secure rural schools transition payments to eligible counties.

SEC. 2. TRANSITIONAL PAYMENTS STATES AND COUNTIES PREVIOUSLY ENTITLED TO PAYMENTS UNDER SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.

(a) TRANSITIONAL PAYMENTS.—Chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 6908. Secure rural schools transition payments

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) ADJUSTED SHARE.—The term 'adjusted share' means the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(A) the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(i) the base share for the eligible county; by

"(ii) the income adjustment for the eligible county; by

"(B) the number equal to the sum of the quotients obtained under subparagraph (A) and paragraph (8)(A) for all eligible counties.

"(2) BASE SHARE.—The term 'base share' means the number equal to the average of—

"(A) the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(i) the number of acres of Federal land described in paragraph (7)(A) in each eligible county; by

"(ii) the total number acres of Federal land in all eligible counties in all eligible States; and

"(B) the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(i) the amount equal to the average of the 3 highest 25-percent payments and safety net payments made to each eligible State for each eligible county during the eligibility period; by

"(ii) the amount equal to the sum of the amounts calculated under clause (i) and paragraph (9)(B)(i) for all eligible counties in all eligible States during the eligibility period.

"(3) COUNTY PAYMENT.—The term 'county payment' means the payment for an eligible county calculated under subsection (c).

"(4) ELIGIBLE COUNTY.—The term 'eligible county' means any county that—

"(A) contains Federal land (as defined in paragraph (7)); and

"(B) elects to receive a share of the State payment or the county payment under subsection (f).

"(5) ELIGIBILITY PERIOD.—The term 'eligibility period' means fiscal year 1986 through fiscal year 1999.

"(6) ELIGIBLE STATE.—The term 'eligible State' means a State or territory of the United States that received a 25-percent payment for 1 or more fiscal years of the eligibility period.

"(7) FEDERAL LAND.—The term 'Federal land' means—

"(A) land within the National Forest System, as defined in section 11(a) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1609(a)) exclusive of the National Grasslands and land utilization projects designated as National Grasslands administered pursuant to the Act of July 22, 1937 (7 U.S.C. 1010-1012); and

"(B) such portions of the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant land as are or may hereafter come under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, which have heretofore or may hereafter be classified as timberlands, and power-site land valuable for timber, that shall be managed, except as provided in the former section 3 of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181c), for permanent forest production.

"(8) 50-PERCENT ADJUSTED SHARE.—The term '50-percent adjusted share' means the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(A) the number equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(i) the 50-percent base share for the eligible county; by

"(ii) the income adjustment for the eligible county; by

"(B) the number equal to the sum of the quotients obtained under subparagraph (A) and paragraph (1)(A) for all eligible counties.

"(9) 50-PERCENT BASE SHARE.—The term '50-percent base share' means the number equal to the average of—

"(A) the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(i) the number of acres of Federal land described in paragraph (7)(B) in each eligible county; by

"(ii) the total number acres of Federal land in all eligible counties in all eligible States; and

"(B) the quotient obtained by dividing—

"(i) the amount equal to the average of the 3 highest 50-percent payments made to each eligible county during the eligibility period; by

“(ii) the amount equal to the sum of the amounts calculated under clause (i) and paragraph (2)(B)(i) for all eligible counties in all eligible States during the eligibility period.

“(10) 50-PERCENT PAYMENT.—The term ‘50-percent payment’ means the payment that is the sum of the 50-percent share otherwise paid to a county pursuant to title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (chapter 876; 50 Stat. 875; 43 U.S.C. 1181f), and the payment made to a county pursuant to the Act of May 24, 1939 (chapter 144; 53 Stat. 753; 43 U.S.C. 1181f-1 et seq.).

“(11) FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—The term ‘full funding amount’ means—

“(A) \$520,000,000 for fiscal year 2008; and

“(B) for fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, the amount that is equal to 90 percent of the full funding amount for the preceding fiscal year.

“(12) INCOME ADJUSTMENT.—The term ‘income adjustment’ means the square of the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the per capita personal income for each eligible county; by

“(B) the median per capita personal income of all eligible counties.

“(13) PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME.—The term ‘per capita personal income’ means the most recent per capita personal income data, as determined by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

“(14) SAFETY NET PAYMENTS.—The term ‘safety net payments’ means the special payment amounts paid to States and counties required by section 13982 or 13983 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-66; 16 U.S.C. 500 note; 43 U.S.C. 1181f note).

“(15) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ‘Secretary concerned’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture or the designee of the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to the Federal land described in paragraph (7)(A); and

“(B) the Secretary of the Interior or the designee of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Federal land described in paragraph (7)(B).

“(16) STATE PAYMENT.—The term ‘State payment’ means the payment for an eligible State calculated under subsection (b)

“(17) 25-PERCENT PAYMENT.—The term ‘25-percent payment’ means the payment to States required by the sixth paragraph under the heading of ‘forest service’ in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

“(b) CALCULATION OF STATE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, the Secretary of Agriculture shall calculate for each eligible State an amount equal to the sum of the products obtained by multiplying—

“(1) the adjusted share for each eligible county within the eligible State; by

“(2) the full funding amount for the fiscal year.

“(c) CALCULATION OF COUNTY PAYMENT AMOUNT.—For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, the Secretary of the Interior shall calculate for each eligible county that received a 50-percent payment during the eligibility period an amount equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

“(1) the 50-percent adjusted share for the eligible county; by

“(2) the full funding amount for the fiscal year.

“(d) PAYMENT AMOUNTS FOR ELIGIBLE STATES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each eligible State an amount equal to the sum of the amounts elected under subsection (f) by each county within the eligible State for—

“(1) if the county is eligible for the 25-percent payment, the share of the 25-percent payment; or

“(2) the share of the State payment of the eligible county.

“(e) PAYMENT AMOUNTS FOR ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each eligible county an amount equal to the amount elected under subsection (f) by the county for—

“(1) if the county is eligible for the 50-percent payment, the 50-percent payment; or

“(2) the county payment for the eligible county.

“(f) ELECTION TO RECEIVE PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

“(1) ELECTION; SUBMISSION OF RESULTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The election to receive a share of the State payment, the county payment, a share of the State payment and the county payment, a share of the 25-percent payment, the 50-percent payment, or a share of the 25-percent payment and the 50-percent payment, as applicable, shall be made at the discretion of each affected county by August 1, 2008, and thereafter in accordance with paragraph (2)(A), and transmitted to the Secretary concerned by the Governor of each eligible State.

“(B) FAILURE TO TRANSMIT.—If an election for an affected county is not transmitted to the Secretary concerned by the date specified under subparagraph (A), the affected county shall be considered to have elected to receive a share of the State payment, the county payment, or a share of the State payment and the county payment, as applicable.

“(2) DURATION OF ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A county election to receive a share of the 25-percent payment or 50-percent payment, as applicable, shall be effective for 2 fiscal years.

“(B) FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—If a county elects to receive a share of the State payment or the county payment, the election shall be effective for all subsequent fiscal years through fiscal year 2011.

“(g) SOURCE OF PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—The payment to an eligible State or eligible county under this section for a fiscal year shall be derived from—

“(1) any revenues, fees, penalties, or miscellaneous receipts, exclusive of deposits to any relevant trust fund, special account, or permanent operating funds, received by the Federal Government from activities by the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service on the applicable Federal land;

“(2) for fiscal year 2008, any funds appropriated to carry out this section; and

“(3) to the extent of any shortfall, out of any amounts in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

“(h) DISTRIBUTION AND EXPENDITURE OF PAYMENTS.—

“(1) DISTRIBUTION METHOD.—A State that receives a payment under this section shall distribute the appropriate payment amount among the appropriate counties in the State in accordance with—

“(A) the Act of May 23, 1908 (16 U.S.C. 500); and

“(B) section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 963; 16 U.S.C. 500).

“(2) EXPENDITURE PURPOSES.—Subject to paragraph (3), payments received by a State under this section and distributed to counties in accordance with paragraph (1), and payments received directly by an eligible county under this section, shall be expended in the same manner in which 25-percent payments or 50-percent payments, as applicable, are required to be expended.

“(3) RESERVATION OF PORTION OF PAYMENTS.—Each eligible county receiving a payment under this section or a portion of a State’s payment under this section shall reserve not less than 15 percent of the amount

received for expenditure in accordance with titles II and III of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393).

“(i) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—The payments required under this section for a fiscal year shall be made as soon as practicable after the end of that fiscal year.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“6908. Secure rural schools transition payments.”

(c) EXTENSION OF TITLES II AND III OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.—

(1) EXTENSION.—The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393) is amended—

(A) in sections 203(a), 204(e)(3)(B)(vi), 207(a), 208, and 303 by striking “2007” and inserting “2011”;

(B) in sections 208 and 303, by striking “2008” and inserting “2012”.

(2) DEFINITION OF PARTICIPATING COUNTY.—The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended—

(A) in section 201(1), by inserting before the period the following: “or that is required to reserve funds under section 6908(h)(3) of title 31, United States Code, or section 3(e) of the Public Land Communities Transition Act of 2008”; and

(B) in section 301(1), by inserting before the period the following: “or that is required to reserve funds under section 6908(h)(3) of title 31, United States Code, or section 3(e) of the Public Land Communities Transition Act of 2008”.

(3) DEFINITION OF PROJECT FUNDS.—The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended—

(A) in section 201(2), by inserting before the period the following: “or reserves under section 6908(h)(3) of title 31, United States Code, or section 3(e) of the Public Land Communities Transition Act of 2008 for expenditure in accordance with this title”; and

(B) in section 301(2), by inserting before the period the following: “or reserves under section 6908(h)(3) of title 31, United States Code, or section 3(e) of the Public Land Communities Transition Act of 2008 for expenditure in accordance with this title”.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS REGARDING TRANSITION PAYMENTS TO CERTAIN STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADJUSTED AMOUNT.—The term “adjusted amount” means, with respect to a covered State—

(A) for fiscal year 2008—

(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 102(a)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393), as in effect on September 29, 2006, for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2008; and

(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 103(a)(2) Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393), as in effect on September 29, 2006, for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2008;

(B) for fiscal year 2009, 90 percent of—

(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under such section 102(a)(2) for the

eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under such section 6908 to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2009; and

(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under such section 103(a)(2) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under such section 6908 to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2009;

(C) for fiscal year 2010, 81 percent of—

(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under section 102(a)(2) for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under such section 6908 to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2010; and

(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under such section 103(a)(2) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under such section 6908 to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2010; and

(D) for fiscal year 2011, 73 percent of—

(i) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under such section 102(a)(2) for the eligible counties in the covered State that have elected under such section 6908 to receive a share of the State payment for fiscal year 2011; and

(ii) the sum of the amounts paid for fiscal year 2006 under such section 103(a)(2) for the eligible counties in the State of Oregon that have elected under such section 6908 to receive the county payment for fiscal year 2011.

(2) COVERED STATE.—The term “covered State” means each of the States of California, Louisiana, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, and Washington.

(3) ELIGIBLE COUNTY.—The term “eligible county” has the meaning given that term in section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act.

(b) TRANSITION PAYMENTS.—For each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011, in lieu of the payment amounts that otherwise would have been made under section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay the adjusted amount to each covered State and the eligible counties within the covered State, as applicable.

(c) DISTRIBUTION OF ADJUSTED AMOUNT.—It is the intent of Congress that the method of distributing the payments under subsection (b) among the counties in a covered State (other than California) for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011 be in the same proportion that the payments were distributed to the eligible counties in that State in fiscal year 2006.

(d) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS IN CALIFORNIA.—The following payments shall be distributed among the eligible counties in the State of California in the same proportion that payments under section 102(a)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393), as in effect on September 29, 2006, were distributed to the eligible counties for fiscal year 2006:

(1) Payments to the State of California under subsection (b).

(2) The shares of the eligible counties of the State payment for California under section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, for fiscal year 2011.

(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Any payment made under subsection (b) shall be considered to be a payment made under section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, except that each eligible county receiving a payment under such subsection or a portion of such payment under subsection (c) or (d) shall reserve not

less than 15 percent of the amount received for expenditure in accordance with titles II and III of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 500 note; Public Law 106-393), as required by subsection (h)(3) of such section 6908.

SEC. 4. CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES FEES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior by regulation shall establish—

(A) a conservation of resources fee for producing Federal oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico; and

(B) a conservation of resources fee for non-producing Federal oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico.

(2) PRODUCING LEASE FEE TERMS.—The fee under paragraph (1)(A)—

(A) subject to subparagraph (C), shall apply to covered leases that are producing leases;

(B) shall be set at \$9 per barrel for oil and \$1.25 per million Btu for gas, respectively, in 2005 dollars; and

(C) shall apply only to production of oil or gas occurring—

(i) in any calendar year in which the arithmetic average of the daily closing prices for light sweet crude oil on the New York Mercantile Exchange (NYMEX) exceeds \$34.73 per barrel for oil and \$4.34 per million Btu for gas in 2005 dollars; and

(ii) on or after October 1, 2006.

(3) NONPRODUCING LEASE FEE TERMS.—The fee under paragraph (1)(B)—

(A) subject to subparagraph (C), shall apply to leases that are nonproducing leases;

(B) shall be set at \$3.75 per acre per year in 2005 dollars; and

(C) shall apply on and after October 1, 2006.

(4) TREATMENT OF RECEIPTS.—Amounts received by the United States as fees under this subsection shall be treated as offsetting receipts.

(b) COVERED LEASE DEFINED.—In this section the term “covered lease” means a lease for oil or gas production in the Gulf of Mexico that is—

(1) in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) issued by the Department of the Interior under section 304 of the Outer Continental Shelf Deep Water Royalty Relief Act (43 U.S.C. 1337 note; Public Law 104-58); and

(3) not subject to limitations on royalty relief based on market price that are equal to or less than the price thresholds described in clauses (v) through (vii) of section 8(a)(3)(C) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(3)(C)).

(c) ROYALTY SUSPENSION PROVISIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall agree to a request by any lessee to amend any lease issued for Central and Western Gulf of Mexico tracts during the period of January 1, 1998, through December 31, 1999, to incorporate price thresholds applicable to royalty suspension provisions, or amend existing price thresholds, in the amount of \$34.73 per barrel (2005 dollars) for oil and for natural gas of \$4.34 per million Btu (2005 dollars).

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON DISTRIBUTION OF SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS TRANSITION PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.

It is the sense of Congress that amounts made available by a State to an eligible county under section 6908 of title 31, United States Code, as added by section 2 of this Act, or under section 3 of this Act to support public schools in that county should be in addition to, and not in lieu of, general funds of the State made available to support public schools in that county, and that the State should not adjust education funding allocations to reflect the receipt of amounts under such section 6908 or section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is incredibly important legislation, and I hope it doesn't devolve into the partisan debate that's been going on earlier today to point the fingers of blame on the current high cost of gasoline at the pump.

This is about another crisis the American people are experiencing, not as widespread as the cost of fuel, but the impact will be even heavier on more than 600 counties in 42 States and hundreds of school districts across America. This is the issue of whether or not we should continue to compensate these counties for the fact that they have very high ownership of Federal lands and Federal forests. Federal forest policy has changed, and their revenues have diminished dramatically, and many of them have no alternative, under their State constitution or other laws, to go out and replace those funds, particularly in the short term.

It's expensive. It would cost \$1.9 billion over 4 years. But being sensitive to the fact that many of us on this side of the aisle feel that the policies of recent years have put the country on the verge of bankruptcy, we pay for it. In fact, with the value of what we have in here as a so-called offset in Washington speak, the way we pay for it, with fees on offshore oil leases that were inadvertently omitted by the Clinton administration, would raise \$3.3 billion. That means we pay for rural schools and counties. That's 7,000 teachers. That's hundreds of deputy sheriffs, hundreds of corrections officers, many roadworkers, other critical public safety folks, public health, all across 42 States in America and 600 counties. We pay for that with this bill. In fact, we would help reduce the deficit, which is something we're handing off to our kids and we do need to deal with, by \$1.4 billion.

Now, some will object to the offset, that the oil companies shouldn't be required to pay a fee even though they got this royalty relief without a cap inadvertently, by mistake, by a previous administration. I really hope that they don't take the debate down that path. That does not do the counties, the schools, the teachers, the police, the deputies, and the others justice.

Let's focus on the issue at hand. They have an alternative to fund this. I have been trying desperately for more than a year. It's been quite some time since this bill came out of committee, and Mr. WALDEN and I joined in a bipartisan way earlier this year in a letter on January 18 to the majority asking that this bill be brought up. And then Mr. WALDEN on May 1 came to the floor with Mr. BLUNT and asked that

the bill be brought up. In fact, he sent out a press release saying it's been 44 legislative days and over 3 months, that it's a strongly bipartisan bill. I hope it stays bipartisan. To extend county payments has been ready for a vote on the House floor. I simply do not understand why the Democratic leadership has not scheduled a vote.

Well, the Democratic leadership has now scheduled a vote. And I hope that we can get back to the bipartisanship. I hope we can get back to the focus of this debate. Let's pass this bill and move it over to the Senate. If you don't like the way it's paid for, if you want to protect the royalty relief for the oil and gas industry, then vote "present," send the bill to the Senate, and see if they can come up with, as they claim, a better way to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is, to be honest, a very sad day on this bill today on the floor. As an educator, I simply understand the need for secure rural schools funding. As a westerner and someone who served for a long time in the State legislature, I understand what payment in lieu of taxes, or PILT, means to western counties.

Unfortunately, though, this bill that is before us today did not get here through regular order. This is not the same bill we discussed in committee nor is it the same bill that I and some others cosponsored. It appears almost as if political games are now being played in an effort to pass this particular bill, which breaks new ground. The precedent has always been, in dealing with secure rural schools and PILT, that we have dealt in a bipartisan manner in an effort to find legal and politically feasible solutions to pay for secure rural schools and payment in lieu of taxes. We have always addressed these two issues in a bipartisan manner, always, until now. H.R. 3058, this version of it, has broken that covenant.

When a version of this numbered bill was passed in the Resources Committee, two promises were made to the Republicans who cosponsored it, Mr. WALDEN and me and others. The first promise was that PILT would not be decoupled from secure rural schools. I cannot stress enough the importance of PILT funding being coupled with secure rural schools, as was promised. Even the majority leader in the Senate has said this is the key to the success of this piece of legislation. And yet this promise was broken.

Second, the offset using the 1998/1999 lease moneys was supposed to be taken out by the time this came to the floor. This set of money, which has already been spent three times on three different bills, not the same pot of money, the exact same dollars which have been spent, is not going to be a solution to this. The gentleman from Oregon suggested last night that there might be

constitutional concerns and we should not listen to those. I have some sympathy for that approach, but the fact of the matter is his speech last night was to the wrong audience. It should be to the lower courts, who have already ruled that this pot of money is not accessible to us.

In 2006 we passed the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act. Using these fees for that was justifiable. Using it in this bill is not justifiable. Those fees for the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act was to fund programs and projects related to conservation of OCS-related resources. It was to increase America's energy supply and encourage domestic energy development on the Outer Continental Shelf. Because we are no longer using that and have now taken them to a different level, it will be a breach of the oil and gas leases and designed to punish energy companies and discourage much-needed domestic oil and gas production. This bill sends now a message to every energy company in America that Congress will not respect lease contracts and will result in less oil, less gas production, which I certainly hope is not the objective of the Democratic Party.

We need to have a different way of paying for this bill that does not include an energy price-increasing bankrupt offset. We need a genuine offset that will pay for both PILT and secure rural schools without making America's energy more expensive, less available. And to be honest, if the court upholds their ruling that they already had, if the other courts do, there won't be any money for secure rural schools in this project anyway.

Now, I know there will be people who will tell us this is merely a bogus placeholder. We don't really mean to use this money as the bill progresses through, which simply shows that perhaps PAYGO is nothing more than an accounting game or scam as we're looking at it, and that all we need to do is give a blank check over to the Senate, pass it along, and they will fill in some reasonable way of funding this particular bill. We will abdicate our responsibility of coming up with legal, legitimate, responsible legislation because somewhere down the line, someone else will do it.

If the Senate, indeed, has a secret magical formula for funding this bill, why wasn't it in the farm bill? Why wasn't it in the extension of the Rural Schools Act? Why did the Senate not put it in a bill and send it over here? Or why did the sponsor not negotiate with the Senate to insert it in this bill so we could discuss it in the House?

The promise was before this bill to the floor there would be a legitimate source for an offset. It is not there. Instead, we seem to be playing a game of political gotcha, which is so sad because there was a compromise that could have funded this bill and done it in a legally effective way. It was presented by the National Education Association on behalf of schools. It was sup-

ported by the consortium of counties. It was supported by energy producers that would have fully funded PILT, fully funded the secure rural schools, expanded energy options. It would have given States control over sand and gravel for beach replenishment, over the viewshed, States control over their offshore renewable energies, would have funded energy and minerals higher education program, and be done with real money, not the funny money in this particular bill. It is language that is similar to a bipartisan bill passed in the 109th Congress which was supported by Mr. DEFAZIO and 39 other Democrats in a bipartisan way.

The question that we have to ask ourselves today is why are we confronted on suspension with a bill that has a phony PAYGO offset, money that we know is not there? Why are we presented with a suspension bill that has already been rejected by the Senate, that has already been rejected by the administration? Why instead did we not agree to go with the compromise approach, which would have had real offsets and provided real solutions to fully fund our schools, to fully fund PILT, and not to have to take it out of the hide of anyone who stops at a gas pump this weekend? Now, that's what we should have done, and we didn't do it. And that's why this is a very, very sad day on a bill that was not discussed in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

Mr. DEFAZIO. It's not phony, it's just painful. Schools, teachers, cops, Big Oil. It's a tough choice for some people. Not for me. I'd be happy to stick with this, all the way through sending it to the President. But some on that side of the aisle, particularly in the Senate, don't want to do that. If the money has not been spent because the Republicans in the Senate have rejected it to pay for other valuable things, this is a valuable thing to pay for.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding and also thank you for your great work on this bill, Mr. DEFAZIO, and thank you especially for paying for the bill.

Mr. Speaker and Members, county governments don't receive property tax for lands owned and controlled by the Federal Government. However, they are obligated to provide services in those areas. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act was created to compensate local governments for the tax exempt status of the public lands within their county. If we fail to reauthorize this important program, teachers will be laid off, kids will be short-changed on their education, and county roads will go unmaintained.

In my district, over 1.2 million acres are controlled by the Federal Government. The National Forest Service

land in my district is twice the size of the State of Rhode Island, and every acre, every acre is exempt from property tax. In one of my counties, 40 percent of the roads are within the National Forest. So that county is responsible for maintaining the roads that run through the very property that is exempt from the taxes that pay for our roads.

It's unconscionable for the Federal Government to walk away from this obligation to rural local governments. Rural counties have no other options. We have made a commitment on this issue. Now let's live up to our word.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. As we now talk about a bill that a commitment was made but does not exist anymore, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, counties and schools in my district need a lifeline. They don't need partisanship. They don't need a talking point. They need leadership, which will result in an actual law being passed to help them.

Secure rural schools has rested on hard work by grassroots supporters and bipartisan efforts in Congress. So why are we moving a bill that divides our coalition by removing PILT and tying secure rural schools to a controversial offset that we know will fail in the Senate?

This bill does nothing to help our counties and schools because it has no chance of becoming law. Yesterday, there was an effort to rescue this legislation with a compromise that would extend a lifeline to rural counties and every American through new domestic oil production and lower gas prices. That proposal was rejected because we were told the majority will not allow consideration of any bill that increases domestic oil supplies.

America and our counties and schools deserve better. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3058, and I want to thank my good friend and colleague, Mr. DEFAZIO, for his hard work and tireless work on this issue.

Almost exactly 100 years ago, Congress passed a law creating a partnership with rural counties with a high percentage of Federal land, and Congress realized that because the Federal lands were off-limits to the counties for development and they would never contribute to the tax base, that these counties should be compensated for permanent loss of any tax revenues. The law allowed a percentage of the revenue produced from Federal land resources to be returned to the county. Counties were then able to use these funds for public safety, public schools, and public roads.

Over the years, because of changes in Federal forest policy, the revenue for Federal lands has decreased and Federal lands are still off limits for development, and this leads many counties

in the American West with dramatic decreases in the tax base.

In 2000, we passed the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act in order to provide a stable base of funding to the affected counties. But that act has not been reauthorized and the Federal payments are scheduled to end June 30. This is a very, very serious issue in Oregon and across the American West, where counties have already, in preparation for this date, in preparation for future budgets, begun to issue pink slips. They have issued pink slips to police, firefighters, teachers, and other essential personnel. It is not an exaggeration to say that Oregonians may have their lives endangered because of these cuts, if they take place.

The bill that my good friend and colleague from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) has submitted would provide an extension of payments through fiscal 2011 to counties that previously received these payments. And to maintain fiscal responsibility, the bill is fully paid for with offsets, and it reduces payments to counties by 15 percent each year, asking all to make sacrifices.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Can I inquire as to the time remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The gentleman from Oregon has 12 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, this program needs to be reauthorized. I represent northeastern California, which is one of the top recipients of money under this Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act, which expired a couple of years ago. Just to give you an example, Plumas County School District in my district receives roughly 20 percent of their annual operating budget from these funds. Without this money, the county is prepared to lay off 9 out of the 16 administrators; 47 teachers out of a total of 150; close all school libraries; possibly close some or all cafeterias; and cut transportation services. Another county adjoining Plumas that I represent is Sierra. They would need to lay off nearly 40 percent of their teachers and administrators.

Today's bill will not become law and therefore does nothing to support our rural counties. We cannot continue to go from year to year without this being resolved. In California, if you don't have the funding assured, layoff notices are sent off by March 15 of the year. For the second year in a row, those layoff notices have already gone out. We lose valuable teachers that do not come back once the funding has been restored.

This debate should be about schools and public infrastructure, not used as fodder to drive an anti-oil agenda. This process that we are using is deplorable. We were told that PILT would be included, but it was stripped out of the

bill on its way to the floor. We were told there would be an acceptable offset, not one that has been rejected on three previous occasions by the U.S. Senate. But there is none.

We are also considering this bill under suspension of the bills, denying the minority a right to offer an alternative and preventing any Member from offering alternative offsets. A compromise has been offered and rejected.

For this reason, I would urge defeat of the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEFAZIO. With that, I would yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I rise in strong support of H.R. 3058, the Public Land Communities Transition Act, and I commend my dear friend, PETER DEFAZIO. I have rarely seen a Member of Congress work so diligently on behalf of his constituents. He also works on behalf of my constituents because in southwest Washington, we are one of the 10 most forested districts in the entire country. So much of the land in my district is under control of the Forest Service. Counties like Lewis, Skamania, and Cowlitz rely on Secure Rural Schools money to keep public safety working.

My friends, we have to work to pass this bill. It is urgent, as many speakers have said. It is a bit ironic, however, to criticize the bill and say the criticism is because this bill will not become law, and then vote against it. Things don't become law around here when people vote against them. Things become law when people vote for them.

Because of that, I would encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill. Without this bill, 600 counties across the country that are home to millions of Americans would be left behind. Without this program, millions of rural communities would face steep job losses, breakdowns in services and infrastructure, and deep cuts to school budgets. Without this funding, almost 7,000 teachers and other educational staff will be laid off across the country. They are facing termination as we speak.

Delay should not be an option. Passage should be our remedy. I urge passage of this fine bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3058, the Public Land Communities Transition Act of 2008. Mr. Speaker, this bill had the opportunity to provide rural schools with

the much-needed funding that allows them to keep their doors open and serve sparsely-populated areas. Unfortunately, the majority decided to offset this bill with provisions that will increase the cost of gas to the American public. Already paying \$4 a gallon at the pumps, Americans should not be forced to bear further increases, especially those living in rural areas that, on average, already drive greater distances.

The fee increases on oil and gas leases would place further confines on domestic energy production at a time when we need to be expanding production and building our Nation's energy independence.

This provision was included in the farm bill that was brought to the House floor a year ago, and was one of several tax increasing provisions that drew criticism from House Members, as well as the Senate and the White House. It would be disingenuous to sing praises of this bill when the cost of providing support to rural schools would be borne by the very rural constituents we are trying to help.

There is a proposed compromise that was introduced in the 109th Congress and enjoyed broad bipartisan support. It would solve the problems created by the oil and gas lease provisions in H.R. 3058 by increasing domestic energy exploration and production, thereby helping to reduce the gas prices for the American consumer. At the same time, this alternative would provide the necessary funding for rural school districts. That alternative would be something I could stand behind but, unfortunately, that is not the bill we are considering today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no." I urge them to vote against the policy that will raise gas prices for Americans when they have the opportunity to do it right and create increased domestic energy production and solve this problem for our rural schools.

Mr. DEFAZIO. At this point I would yield 1½ minutes to the gentlelady from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) whose district is impacted.

Ms. HOOLEY. I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. DEFAZIO, for all of the work that he has done on this bill. Look, I grew up in a family where if you made a promise, you kept that promise. A deal is a deal.

County payments available for 100 years are payment for the Federal Government owning 57 percent of the forested land in Oregon. If the Federal Government did not make these payments, these counties would have very little in the way of infrastructure funding.

This money will cut the following services if we don't have it, and it will impact our most vulnerable citizens: Loss of sheriffs; loss of DAs; loss of economic development services and juvenile services; loss of mental health services, public health, and in general, loss of veterans services and senior services. The loss of county payments

means the loss of sheriffs. In just one county, Curry County alone, three sheriffs will have to patrol an area the same size as Connecticut, which has a police force of 2,000.

This bill is a 4-year extension of the Secure Rural Schools. This program will not continue unless we give this an appropriation. It needs to pass to provide that critical funding for our counties. I cannot over-emphasize the need for this legislation for Oregon and for the Nation to maintain its 100-year-old bargain with the National Forest States. I encourage my colleagues to support its passage today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. May I inquire how much time is left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 9.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, I would yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Resources Committee, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

(Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1430

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came out of the committee, I thought we had an agreement where there would be an offset and a payment of the bill. Unfortunately, that did not occur, so consequently I will be voting against this legislation because it doesn't do what it says it is going to do. Very frankly, this is funny money, and the schools won't be, as we want them to be, funded, and that is unfortunate.

But I am also going to talk about a lot of the statements on the floor, and my good friend from Oregon has to understand that I do watch the debate. There were some statements made that I think were incorrect, in fact I know, not think, about ANWR and about PET4 and about independence.

There has been no oil shipped overseas from Alaska. It all goes to the West Coast, at one time through the Panama Canal, through a pipeline, for American consumption, all 17 billion barrels of oil. And if we were to open ANWR or the Chukchi Sea it would go to the United States. It wouldn't go overseas to China or Japan. We could make sure of that as we vote for it on this House floor, as we did when we had the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

I think it is important that the American public recognize that we do have a supply problem. And anybody who denies that, I have heard these arguments for 25 years, well, we only do have one month or 6 months or whatever it is oil supply, so we shouldn't do it. If we have that 1 million barrels a day, Chavez would not have the ability to blackmail us, or if Nigeria had an upheaval, there wouldn't be the spike in oil prices.

A lot of people are pointing their fingers at all the problems, the big oil,

the speculators, and I do think there is some merit in the speculators because they know we haven't acted on the supply side ever since the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Not one time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Let's follow this train a little bit further. If we don't increase our supply, Mr. and Mrs. America, instead of \$4 a gallon, it is going to be \$10 a gallon by January 1.

We must act in this Congress, and if you do not, may the wrath come down on you and may you be punished for what you have not done. We must address this issue in this Congress. I urge my colleagues to consider the supply side. Consider it. And this legislation itself has its weak points, too.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3058, the Public Land Communities Transition Assistance Act. As the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, I do want to express my deep appreciation to the gentleman from Oregon, PETER DEFAZIO, for his strongly tenacious efforts and determined determination on behalf of this legislation. He has more than adequately explained the bill. My purpose is to stress the urgency of this body acting on the legislation.

This legislation, commonly referred to as the "county payments bill," was enacted in 2000 to provide stability in revenue sharing payments made to the States and counties containing Federal forest lands. This funding has been extremely important, critically so in many cases, in assisting schools and communities in rural counties across the country, including my home State of West Virginia. Yet the Congress has failed to reauthorize the program.

This Congress, with a Democratic majority, is attempting to pick up the pieces of a program that was looking at being eliminated square in the eye. Last year we managed to pass a 1-year extension of county payments, but that is due to expire at the end of this month. So I cannot stress enough the urgency of today's vote.

Critical funding for schools and county services across the country will evaporate if we do not act today. Indeed, the National Forest Counties and Schools Coalition estimates that about 7,000 teachers and other educational staff will be laid off as of June 30th when their contracts expire if this body does not act. That is something worth thinking about. Students in rural forest counties across this Nation will be deprived of almost 7,000 teachers and the other educational staff.

Now, some have taken issue with the pay-for, the offset being used for this bill, which is a conservation of resources fee on a class of Federal oil and gas leases in the Gulf of Mexico that

are unduly enjoying royalty relief by virtue of not having price thresholds.

This is not a new proposal. This body has considered it before, and rightly so. My colleagues, to date the American people have been deprived of over \$1 billion in Federal royalties as a result of this situation. That is over 1 billion with a "B" dollars, something worth thinking about.

We now learn that in the future if this situation is not corrected, the American people will be fleeced to the tune of \$4 billion and to a high of \$14 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. RAHALL. That figure could go as high as \$14 billion, depending on the price of oil and natural gas and the amount produced from these leases.

So it is very important that we recognize this bill does have funding sources and that is what we are trying to do here, at the same time generating funds to pay for teachers and the education of our school children.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons this Congress has the lowest approval ratings in poll history is it keeps playing political games instead of solving real problems like energy prices or supporting our troops in Iraq.

Today we are doing the same, playing games with our rural schools, with our rural counties, with our rural firefighters and police forces. Unfortunately, this bill is deadlier than a door-nail, only because some political genius decided they would like to pit those of us who support rural schools against our energy companies. Well, guess what? Everyone loses, especially our rural communities who fought for this. This bill is a shame.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. It's teachers or cops or Big Oil.

With that, I would yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN).

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3058, the Public Land Communities Transition Assistance Act, and I too thank the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO, for his tireless efforts to reauthorize the Secure Rural Schools program. I also thank the House Committee on Natural Resources and the House leadership for their work on this legislation.

H.R. 3058 would reauthorize the secure rural schools program for 4 years. Annual payments to counties impacted by National Forest lands are an important part of many school districts' budgets, and failure to reauthorize the Secure Rural schools would force very difficult decisions in counties and school districts in over 40 States.

In the State of South Dakota, the Black Hills National Forest is a special place and a highly valued resource. Yet the national ownership of this land has clear impacts on finances of counties in western South Dakota. For example, under the Secure Rural Schools program, Custer County schools receive approximately \$310,000 for the 2007–2008 school year. If this program isn't reauthorized, Custer schools would receive about \$90,000. The loss of \$210,000 would likely lead to eliminating numerous teaching positions and increasing class sizes to as many as 40 students per class.

Custer County isn't alone. If we fail to reauthorize the secure rural schools program, almost 7,000 teachers and other educational staff will be laid off across the country as of June 30, 2008, when their contracts expire. H.R. 3058 provides a new distribution formula and transition payments as counties adjust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN. On the offset, by my count, 48 of my Republican colleagues have in the past voted for legislation that included this offset. That was all in 2007, before oil went over \$100 a barrel. So I would think that even those of us that do support expanded exploration and drilling for energy sources on public lands would agree that it should be equitable and Federal royalty payments should be paid when we are extracting oil resources from public lands.

I encourage my colleagues to support this fair, bipartisan bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire as to the time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 5½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I suggest the gentleman use some of his time, because I only have one more speaker and then I will be closing.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) who has worked tirelessly on this issue in a bipartisan way in the past.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that we have arrived here today like an out-of-control car skidding to a stop. Let's not forget why we are here. We are here because of a changed Federal timber policy that has bankrupted the people that live in my district and many of yours, and as a result we now have fires at costs that are unbelievable. They are historic. We are burning more acres of our Federal forests than at any time in our Nation's history, and we are paying more for it. Forty-seven percent of the Federal budget for the Forest Service now goes to put out fires.

Yet we have shut down the Federal forests from active management. That is why we are here today, because the revenues that used to flow to our communities to pay for basic services, to be the good partner that Teddy Roosevelt envisioned the great forest reserves more than 100 years ago, to be a partnership with the local community, that partnership, that bond, that pledge has been broken. People are put out of work. Services are lost.

The tragedy that brings us here today is another broken promise, and that is when this bill was considered by the House Natural Resources Committee there was a consistent and common pledge that this bill would be brought to the floor with a different offset.

I have a quote here from the spokesperson from the committee that makes that very clear. It says very clearly, it is definitely our intention for the money not to come from increased fees on oil and gas companies.

It is definitely not our intention for the money to come from increased fees on oil and gas companies. That is what the committee said. I just couldn't read it. It is too far in front of me. I apologize.

That clearly is not the case. It is clearly not the case. So we have before us a bill with a broken promise, first of all, and it didn't have to be that way.

Yes, I have come to this floor repeatedly and called for this bill to come to this floor for consideration. I don't know why it was held hostage for 130 or so days. But I came here calling for this bill to come to the floor with the clear understanding, the promise and pledge of that committee that it would come here with a different offset, one that was palatable. That promise and pledge was broken.

Meanwhile, I know the Speaker was out in Oregon a while back and said where we go from here is we ought to phase out that system. That doesn't sound like the Speaker is very supportive to me.

So what we have here today is an offset of questionable legality. And I say that not because I am a lawyer, I am not, but because of court cases that have occurred that said when it comes to levying a fee on conservation of resources on the Outer Continental Shelf, that leases that exist today prohibit the application of future laws and regulations except future regulations related to conservation of the resources of the Outer Continental Shelf.

What does that mean in real people talk? It means if you are going to levy the fee that you plan to levy, you have to spend it in a legal way, which is on conservation efforts on the Outer Continental Shelf, or else the courts will say you are not following the decisions we already gave you, *Mobil v. U.S.*, among others. So this is of questionable legal status.

So, I asked my colleague from Oregon, we talked, we have worked really closely on this issue over the years in

a bipartisan manner, and I said I think we are going to have a lot of problems on our side with this and I don't think it is legal. And indeed that is where we are today.

So we have exchanged letters. My colleague wrote me on May 30. Mr. DEFAZIO said if you have other suggestions for offsets that won't raise the ire of oil patch or mineral-dependent Members, I would welcome the input. So we talked on Monday and I said give me a day. This is rushed on the suspension of the rules. Give me a day to come up with an alternative, and we did.

We spent all day yesterday with the Congressional Budget Office, technical experts, legal experts, and we came up with a proposal that legally funds county payments, legally and fully funds PILT, legally and fully accesses energy resources on the Outer Continental Shelf. It is very similar to a proposal that my colleague from the Fourth District voted for that was passed by this house less than 2 years ago that would generate revenue legally. By the way, for those 98-99 leases, we do levy a fee so that they do pay, but we do it in a constitutional legal way so it is applied for conservation, coastal line improvements.

□ 1445

So we get at the 98-99 lease issue in a legal way under this proposal. The Coalition of County Roads and Schools, we presented this to them yesterday afternoon, they embraced it wholeheartedly. But it was rejected.

Under suspension of the rules, I am not allowed to offer it as an alternative. If this bill goes down today on a vote on the suspension calendar, it can be brought up. The placeholder that this represents is a seat on a bus going into a cliff. It is going off the cliff and into a chasm. Fortunately, there is a cable attached to that bus. If this goes down today, counties aren't lost. They can come back, bring it up under a rule and we can have a real and substantive debate about a way to fully fund it.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 30, 2008.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR GREG: As you know, I worked with the administration to come up with several other potential offsets to pay for a multi-year extension of the county payments program. Unfortunately, those offsets were strongly objected to on a bi-partisan basis. If you have other suggestions for offsets that won't raise the ire of oil patch or mineral-dependent members, I would welcome the input.

I look forward to talking to you this afternoon or on Monday.

Sincerely,

PETER A. DEFAZIO,
Member of Congress.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Just in response, the gentleman asked three times to bring this bill to the floor with these offsets, and the gentleman from Utah actually said in committee: I am specifically

looking at offshore drilling fees, which is a concept of a new fee that is there. I am more than happy to go in that direction.

But today they're not.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy as I appreciate his leadership and tireless effort to help keep this alive.

I understand the frustration of my friend from Oregon that just spoke. He should be frustrated, because his Republican Party was in total control for 6 years with the Presidency, with both Houses of Congress, and there is a situation that he doesn't like. I understand it. I understand his frustration. If I were in his position, I would be, too. It was the Republican Congress that did not extend this program and allowed it to expire.

There is a simple choice before us today where we have an opportunity to deal with the needs of hundreds of thousands of rural Americans, not just in Oregon, but from 40 States around the country, or the interests of a few oil companies who are making money hand over fist, and they are making some money that they shouldn't because they are not paying what they should under the leases.

We have already dealt with this canard that somehow the answer is to give the oil industry access to more land to drill. Oil companies have been granted 42 million acres of which they are only using 12 million currently, so they have 30 million acres of area that they could potentially drill and they are not drilling now. Somehow we should come up with something more to give to them, allow them to have more money, ignores the issue here today.

I would suggest that we ought to respect the work of Mr. DEFAZIO in bringing this forward. Frankly, I was frustrated at the negative comment about Speaker PELOSI who said that, instead of pushing these people off a cliff, that she would work to cushion the blow, to help phase it down. She was trying to help instead of cutting them off. She has been helpful in moving this forward, and taking a shot at the Speaker is unfair and if you are trying to solve the problem, it is unwise.

It is the Republicans for 6 years that had the control, who didn't exercise it. This is a constructive alternative. I suggest that we recognize the need of these hundreds of thousands of Americans, not a few oil companies.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield to myself the balance of our time.

I appreciate Chairman RAHALL from the committee coming down here earlier to speak on the bill. When this bill was under his control, he treated us with kindness and consideration.

In the tornado of words that we have heard here today, there is one thought that still comes through: We need a permanent solution. This bill is half a

bill without a permanent solution and without an offset that is legitimate. The counties, the education community, and the energy companies presented a real solution that would really pay, not a phony placeholder, but real money that would pay for full tilt, full secure rural schools, a real solution to real problems. This bill is the wrong bill, the wrong process, at the wrong time, and should be defeated.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of our time.

This is a difficult choice. It is always difficult to choose between your constituents and your patrons. The patrons heavily to that side of that aisle have been Big Oil. This would hurt Big Oil. They would actually have to pay a fee for leases that were written improperly where they don't pay any royalties to the American taxpayers at a time of record prices. That hurts.

Yes, it is true. So far, a bare minority of Senators have rejected it, previously. Maybe they won't this time. Maybe with oil at \$125 a barrel they will go along with it and say we can get some good out of this for a change. We can help kids get an education. We can keep teachers employed. We can provide money to police our counties and to keep people in jail who need to be there, and for other public services and public works. We can do those things. But we have got to have some guts. Every once in a while you have got to stand up.

We hear all this stuff, all we need is more leases. Their staff boycotted a meeting last week. They sprung a proposal last night, which is a Republican bill, not a single Democrat on it, and would open up offshore oil drilling, which is not acceptable to the Republican Governor of California, to the Republican Governor of Florida, and many others. It is a nonstarter. Come on, guys, let's get real. This is your choice. This is it.

There are 6,312 nonproducing leases on the OCS. This bill would make those companies begin to produce, or pay a fee for not producing. If you want to help provide more supply, which is what a lot of the debate has been about today, let's impose a fee on those 6,312 wells. And, in the meantime, let's get some good of that money for the American people. Help 7,000 teachers, help the kids in rural schools, help our deputy sheriffs, help our people who do corrections, help the people who have a backlog of road and bridge projects all across rural America. Help 42 States. Help 600 counties.

This is your only vote. This is your time. Sometimes you have to make tough choices. I urge an "aye" vote on this bill.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, H.R. 3058, represents a thinly veiled attempt to create a partisan fight over a nonpartisan issue. For several years now, Members from both sides of the aisle have struggled to find a way to pay for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools program.

We have found such a compromise in Congressman Walden's substitute to H.R. 3058. But that is not what we are voting on today.

The Walden compromise that has been approved by the stakeholder organizations contains reauthorization of both Payments in Lieu of Taxes and the Secure Rural Schools program which are so vital for people whose counties are majority owned by the Federal Government, and thus don't have the property tax base to support education. But that is not the bill we are voting on today.

The proposed Walden compromise addresses our growing energy crisis by expanding state control and protection of the outer continental shelf, and by producing new energy in the deep ocean. It provides funding for front-end engineering and design grants for coal-to-liquids, oil shale, tar sands, carbon sequestration, and enhanced oil recovery.

Congressman WALDEN'S compromise proposal contains provisions that have been previously debated on this floor, passed by this body, and approved by the administration. But that is not the bill we are voting on today.

The bill we are voting on today breaks contracts that were negotiated in good faith between the previous administration and American energy providers. The bill we are voting on today has prompted a veto threat, and will probably not even make it through the House today. If the majority wants to make this a partisan vote, so be it. That is their prerogative. But let me make one thing clear; the superintendents of Groveton, Crockett, Latexo, Grapeland, Lovelady, and Kennard Independent School Districts do not care about partisanship. The reality of what we are doing today is that these, and thousands of other school administrators, are going to have to cut jobs and programs as they see their revenues shrink drastically. All for the sake of making a political statement.

When Congress decided to take land out of the tax base of thousands of rural counties in order to create our National Forest System, we made a promise to help cover the cost of education. We have a chance to fulfill this promise by taking up the Walden compromise for Secure Rural Schools and PILT reauthorization. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the political stab before us today, and I urge majority to bring to the floor Congressman WALDEN'S proposal as soon as possible. Our rural communities depend on it.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support for H.R. 3058, the Public Lands Communities Transition Act. This legislation will provide crucial funding to school districts located in Federal forest counties. Without these funds, these school districts will have to make large cuts to their educational services and programs.

It is imperative to address the fact that these counties have little to no local tax base to levy for their school districts. Therefore, any assistance from the Federal Government is essential.

Mr. Speaker, with the passage of this bill, we will ensure that the education of our children will not fall victim to devastating cuts in these areas. Adequate education should be provided to all of our children, regardless of where they live. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill with bipartisan support.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3021, 21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1234 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1234

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3021) to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants and low-interest loans to local educational agencies for the construction, modernization, or repair of public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill

for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3021 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SUTTON. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

I yield myself such time as I may consume. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 1234.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1234 provides for consideration of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Facilities Act, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Education and Labor. The rule makes in order eight amendments which are printed in the Rules Committee report. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today in strong support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Facilities Act. This legislation is important and groundbreaking because it simultaneously addresses important issues confronting our Nation in the 21st century, improving our education system, modernizing our buildings and infrastructures to be environmentally sustainable, and creating jobs to grow our economy.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's school districts are struggling to make essential improvements during these lean economic times. According to recent estimates, America's schools are hundreds of billions of dollars short of the funding needed to ensure that every student attends a high quality facility. Too many parents across this country are forced to drop off their children at schools that are falling apart, schools with leaking roofs and faulty electrical systems, schools with outdated technology which compromises their ability to achieve and succeed.

Our bill provides \$33.2 billion over 5 years for schools across the country for projects to modernize, renovate, and repair their facilities. This funding is crucial to improve our schools so that

the students have a healthy and safe environment in which to learn and develop the knowledge and the skills necessary to compete in today's workforce.

H.R. 3021 also addresses disparities in school facilities funding. It directs the Secretary of Education to distribute funds to school districts according to the same need-based formula used under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides funding for low income school districts. Funding provided in this bill can be used for energy efficiency and technology improvements, asbestos removal and lead abatement, and for ensuring that schools are prepared for emergencies. The funding is provided with few restrictions, which will allow individual schools to satisfy their individual needs.

Renovating schools so that they are environmentally sustainable will provide numerous health and educational benefits for students. Increasing air quality and lighting will enhance our students' ability to focus and learn, while reducing student sick days and improving the health of students with asthma and other respiratory problems.

□ 1500

Green schools also cost about 2 percent less than conventional schools, while providing financial benefits that are 20 times as large, utilizing 33 percent less energy and 32 percent less water than traditional schools.

Enabling students to attend environmentally sustainable schools not only insures a healthy learning environment. It will also naturally facilitate environmental literacy in our youth. This will help our children grow into stewards of our environment and natural resources that we must treasure and preserve for future generations.

Unfortunately, many schools in my district and across the Nation are also forced to address difficult security challenges. For example, Brunswick High School in my district is the largest single-level high school building in Ohio, stretching a quarter of a mile from end to end with 60 entrances. As you can imagine, this presents a formidable security challenge for teachers and administrators.

For these reasons, Congresswoman MCCARTHY and I have worked to include a provision in the manager's amendment for this legislation that will allow schools to improve building infrastructure to accommodate security measures and security doors.

This bill authorizes \$100 million a year through 2013 specifically for public schools in the gulf coast that are still working to rebuild from the devastation that Hurricanes Katrina and Rita wrought three years ago.

Families in the gulf coast are still fighting to recover and to put their lives back together. Mr. Speaker, we must continue to devote extra resources so that those schools and those communities can rebuild.

School modernization is the central purpose of 3021. Equally important and necessary is the essential economic stimulus that this bill will provide by creating more than 100,000 new jobs for American workers who design and build schools, from roofing contractors, construction workers and electricians, to architects and engineers. It's estimated that this bill will result in the creation of nearly 4,000 jobs in my home State of Ohio in 2009 alone.

Mr. Speaker, in these challenging economic times, important and innovative legislation such as this bill will go a long way to creating new opportunities for America's workforce. Passing this bill will enable school districts to upgrade their facilities and lead our Nation's students towards a brighter and healthier future while addressing the job crisis we face today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, the House is set to consider H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act. This bill will direct the Secretary of Education to make grants and loans to local educational agencies for the construction, modernization or repair of public educational facilities. It also would require the funds to be used only for projects that meet certain green standards such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, Energy Star, or an equivalent State or local standard.

Tomorrow, we are scheduled to consider H.R. 5540, to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Water Trails Network.

I spent last week, Mr. Speaker, meeting and speaking with constituents in my district about the issues that matter to them, and no one mentioned anything closely related to these two bills. Both of these bills may be important in their own right, but I believe there are other issues that are much more pressing, issues we should be debating.

When Americans are paying \$4 a gallon for gasoline, we should be working on legislation to lower the cost of gasoline, increasing domestic energy exploration, reducing our reliance on unstable foreign energy.

France produces over 80 percent of its electricity from nuclear power, and there's a strong environmental movement in France. And yet the United States hasn't built a nuclear power plant in 30 years.

When our military forces are running out of personnel, operation and maintenance funds, we should be working to bring bipartisan legislation to the President's desk that he can quickly sign and fund the troops.

When the intelligence community is stripped of one of their key tools in the fight against international terrorism because the majority let the Protect

America Act expire, we should be working to give our intelligence officials the tools they need to stop terrorist attacks.

Instead, the majority has decided to work on a green schools bill and a water trails network reauthorization. These are not exactly the pressing issues facing Americans every day. These are not the issues our constituents want us working on today.

One of the central tenets of the Democrats' campaign in 2006, Mr. Speaker, was that they would run Congress in a more open and bipartisan manner. On December 6, 2006, the distinguished Speaker, Ms. PELOSI, reiterated her campaign promise. She said, "we promised the American people that we would have the most honest and open government, and we will."

However, that promise has yet to come to fruition as the majority has consistently blocked an open process through the Rules Committee. A prime example of how they've consistently stymied openness and bipartisanship is by the number of open rules that they've allowed in the 110th Congress. We're three-quarters of the way through the 110th Congress, and so far the majority has allowed only one open rule. One open rule, Mr. Speaker, in 18 months.

They had a chance to double to two the open rules last night, but by a party line vote they decided that they would once again use a restrictive rule process in making only four Republican amendments in order. They struck down 15 Republican amendments that had been introduced, including one from the ranking member of the Education and Labor Committee, Mr. McKEON. So much for the open process they promised.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, at this point I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) for agreeing to handle this rule on this piece of legislation, and for her strong support of this legislation to provide for green high-performing public schools and the facilities in which our children learn.

This legislation comes along at a time when the record is very clear that in far too many instances our Nation's school buildings are literally crumbling around the students that we send to them every day. They're in desperate need of renovation; they're in desperate need of remodeling; they're in desperate need of modernization, so that our students who attend those schools every day can have a safe learning environment.

Not only will this bill help improve student achievement by providing students and teachers with modern, clean,

safe and healthy learning environment, but it will also give a boost to our economy and help make schools a part of the solution to the global warming crisis.

It is this kind of forward thinking and innovative policy that is needed to strengthen our Nation and help build a brighter future. By addressing a number of key challenges at once, this bill is a clear win for our children, for the workers and for our planet.

I would like to thank my colleagues who were instrumental in drafting this legislation and working on it many years. I want to thank Congressman BEN CHANDLER, the author of this bill, for the hard work and dedication of moving this legislation through the House.

I would also like to thank Congressman DALE KILDEE, the Chair of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education for his work on this bill. Mr. KILDEE has been a longtime champion of efforts to improve the physical conditions of our Nation's schools, and he deserves great credit for his leadership in this area.

I also want to thank Congressman DAVE LOEBSACK, who joined the fight the moment he stepped foot into the Congress. Like Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBSACK is a former teacher, and he understands firsthand the difference that a top-notch facility, that a modern facility, that a safe facility, that a clean facility can mean to a child's education. That's the promise of this legislation.

And I would like to recognize the efforts of Congressmen RUSH HOLT, CHARLIE RANGEL, BOB ETHERIDGE and Congresswoman DARLENE HOOLEY, who is the head of the Green Schools Caucus.

As study after study has told us, we don't have a choice when it comes to rebuilding our schools. We simply won't be able to provide every child with the world-class education they need and deserve unless we're willing to help the States and school districts improve the conditions of these buildings and facilities. It's not a question of if we should modernize and repair our Nation's schools; it's a matter of when. It's simply a decision that we have to make and we can make it today.

Today we have that opportunity to begin this investment, an investment that will yield great results for our children, our economy and our future.

Finally, I want to thank all of the members of the Rules Committee for the consideration of this rule, for the reporting of this rule, and to Chairwoman SLAUGHTER for her diligence in making sure that this rule came to the floor.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding me the time.

I rise today in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, last night the Rules Committee voted along party lines to not allow the U.S. House of Representatives, this body, to even consider two amendments that I offered that would have helped school districts whose tax bases are significantly reduced by the presence of tax-exempt Federal lands.

This bill would drastically expand the Federal Government's role in school construction and maintenance, activities historically funded at the State and local level before. But they're doing this before the Federal Government meets its existing responsibilities to schools that are impacted by Federal land ownership.

Mr. Speaker, over 33 percent of my district in Central Washington is owned by the Federal Government; making 11 school districts eligible for Impact Aid programs. I know all too well the consequences of Federal land ownership and the impact it has on the ability of schools to make needed improvements.

In the Grand Coulee Dam area in my district, students attend classes in buildings that are more than half a century old and that are literally falling apart. While the local residents in those districts have agreed to pay one of the highest school levies to maintain current levels in the State of Washington, the school district remains unable to secure a bond to make improvements on physical facilities because the community is surrounded by Federal lands and, therefore, has a limited tax base.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to ensure that no child's education is shortchanged because of Federal land ownership. And, in my view, it's only fair that the Federal Government take care of federally impacted schools before launching a brand new spending program costing billions of dollars that's aimed at schools that aren't federally impacted.

I offered two amendments in the Rules Committee. The first would have required that our commitment to federally impacted schools be met through full funding in the Impact Aid program before funding is spent on new Federal spending in this bill.

My second amendment, which I offered along with my colleague, ROBIN HAYES of North Carolina, would have simply given preference, preference, to federally impacted schools as the new construction and maintenance funds were distributed.

Unfortunately, Democrat leadership blocked both of my amendments from being debated or voted on today on the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, if the Federal Government cannot meet its current responsibilities to federally impacted schools, then it certainly has no business creating a brand new \$20 billion spending program for other schools. Rather than passing this massive expansion of the Federal Government's role in school

construction, we should refocus our efforts on fulfilling existing obligations to schools and children impacted by Federal actions.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question and against the underlying bill.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I appreciate the gentlelady's courtesy in permitting me to speak on the bill, the work that is done by the Rules Committee in bringing this legislation before us. I am enthusiastically supportive of the rule and the underlying bill.

An opportunity to integrate sustainability into the neighborhood school, the building block of communities, is a double win. In the long run, this is going to save significant amounts of money at a time of skyrocketing energy prices. And the evidence is that at the green schools I've seen in my community, there's actually better performance. There's better performance on the part of the students, higher job satisfaction with the staff, and as I have seen in communities around the country where these principles are integrated into the school construction, it is a valuable learning experience for the children themselves.

I am particularly pleased in elements dealing with the transportation, allowing some of the facilities work to be done to help our children get to school safely on foot or cycling.

□ 1515

In 1969, so long ago that I was still in school, over half of America's children were able to get to school on their own walking or biking. By 2001, that percentage had fallen to 15 percent, and I routinely do work in other parts of the country where that percentage is under 10 percent where children can safely get to school on their own.

This poses an inordinate problem in terms of the costs for transportation for school districts. We're all familiar in our own communities with schools that have a rush hour around the start of school, and then there's the rush hour to commuting. It complicates lives for families, it's a problem of congestion and pollution, and with energy prices projected to continue to remain high, it costs money.

But with the provisions of this legislation, we're going to have resources available that compliment our Safe Routes to School legislation in the last transportation reauthorization to be able to help, once again, children to be able to walk and bike safely to school.

At a time when we are looking at 10 million young people of school age who are overweight, and when the projection is that by 2010, 20 percent of the school-age population will be obese, this is an opportunity to help children, particularly when one of the failures of No Child Left Behind is that there isn't a provision for physical education in our schools.

This is a triple win. I strongly urge support.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding, and I do rise in opposition to the rule and the bill. I don't think in my entire time in Congress I have ever opposed anything that provides additional funding for education, but I think this bill has many underlying elements we have to pay some attention to.

I don't disagree with virtually anything I've heard from the other side of the aisle in terms of what this might do. There is, as Mr. MILLER indicated, a desperate need for rebonding and renovation. We do need good schools. I think it would help our children. I'm in full agreement with all of that.

I'm also in full agreement with the gentlewoman from Ohio who said there's hundreds of billions of dollars of these kinds of renovations which are needed out there in the referenda for many of those things which are going on.

The issue is what else is needed to be done in education and what can we afford to do at the public government level.

If you look carefully at this bill and analyze the bottom-line expenditures, it's \$6.4 billion for the first year of fiscal year 2009. It sets some thereafter for the basic renovations. There's \$100 million for each of 5 years for emergency help in those States which were so devastated by storms which perhaps could be done separately, and I would have no problems with them, Louisiana, Mississippi, et cetera.

The title III provision is the green provision which calls for a percentage of this money to be spent for green aspects of our schools, as we should be doing. This is something the Federal Government has not done heretofore. We have had certain responsibilities either assigned to us or done by statute in some way or another, and one of those is an amendment which I introduced saying that before we do this, we should fully fund the authorization of title I. It is very arguable that if we have good schools, our students will do better. I think it's even more arguable that if we have the necessary teachers and other personnel to make absolutely sure the kids are going to be well-educated, they will do even better than that.

In title I last year, we appropriated \$13.9 billion, but we have authorized \$25 billion for title I. IDEA is not a part of this bill in particular, but again, we're not up to the statutory mandate of that which is up to 40 percent of contribution by the Federal Government; and if we were to add the \$6.4 billion to that, we would get very close to that number which would be \$17.3 billion.

This is money that we should be spending, and we can't afford to for one

reason or another. I've heard the old saw about spending on the war, or whatever it may be. But the bottom line is there's going to be so much spending on education and other resources this year, and my judgment is that we are really opening the door here. If we open this door at \$6.4 billion without hundreds of billions of dollars that are needed, we're going to find that that's going to double almost overnight when they find out there is a Federal resource for it.

The pressure in this place to take that up to \$10 billion, \$15, \$20 billion a year is going to be overwhelming, and all of a sudden, the education programs which we have a responsibility to be funding, which was so important to the basic instruction of kids, will fall by the wayside.

I would urge all of the Members oppose this rule.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to both this restrictive rule and the underlying bill brought forward today by the Democratic majority.

As a former chairman of the Marietta City School Board in my district, I strongly believe that there needs to be more of an emphasis on public school construction but at the State and local level. However, H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act, sends the wrong message of how the Federal Government should be involved in local education decisions.

With limited exception in the 1930s and 1940s, the Federal Government has rightly left the responsibility of public school construction up to the State and local governments. State and local governments know the construction needs in schools much better than bureaucrats in Washington. And the Federal Government has promoted the autonomy and flexibility of local control over education in this matter. However, this bill would negate much of this work and would only expand the size and scope of the Federal Government, as my good friend from Delaware, Mr. CASTLE, just pointed out.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3021 would cost \$20 billion over 5 years for a brand new Federal program to compete for the already precious Federal assistance dollars for education. Currently these funds are focused on the curriculum needs of States through our title I grants to provide assistance to low-income and disadvantaged students, as well as funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, for special education.

Mr. Speaker, I can remember when I was on the Education and Workforce Committee in the 108th Congress when

we were in the majority. There was this outcry constantly from the Democrats about not funding fully to the 40 percent level of IDEA, and of course the trajectory of spending in the Bush administration under Republican majority was a geometric progression. We spent much more money than the Democrats have spent in the previous 10 or 12 years when they were in control.

But now we're going to take this money that should be spent on these programs like title I and IDEA and create a whole new program. It makes no sense. If enacted, it will create abundant squeeze, make it less likely the Federal Government will be able to fulfill financial commitments that have already been made for student achievement.

Mr. Speaker, we need to continue promoting local control over education decisions while providing Federal assistance for student achievements. The best and most immediate way that we can do that is by defeating the previous question and the rule for H.R. 3021. For these reasons, I ask that all of my colleagues oppose the rule and the underlying legislation.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am going to reserve my time until the gentleman has closed for his side and has yielded back his time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished lady from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN).

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, as the author of an amendment that was not made in order under this rule, I rise in opposition to this rule. My amendment would have prohibited taxpayer funds authorized by this bill from being used to purchase mercury-laden compact fluorescent light bulbs, also known as the CFL.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take the choice away from public schools as to how to meet their lighting needs. In fact, I believe that Congress already makes, too often, decisions for our citizens. But it is Congress' single-minded dangerous pursuit of this environmental fad that has gotten us all to this point of silliness today.

Congress must ensure that mercury-laden light bulbs are safe before we encourage their use in our child's classrooms. There are very serious health concerns about these light bulbs that are filled with mercury. They pose problems to humans precisely because of their high mercury content, and we must be sure of their safety before we force them on our public school children through this ill-conceived law.

When mercury light bulbs break, let's remember, extensive cleanup is needed. That's what these regulations show us. This is very highly selective and very detailed clean-up regulations.

What does this mean for school children that could be exposed to light bulbs of the broken mercury latent light bulbs? On the EPA's own Web site

are these eight pages of instructions about how to deal with a mercury spill, specifically including spills due to broken mercury light bulbs.

Let me run you through just some of the steps for cleaning up just one broken mercury light bulb.

Before the clean-up ever begins, people must leave the room for 15 minutes as the room airs out putting a halt to the learning that's taking place in the classroom. The school then is told to shut off their central air-conditioning system, or, in Minnesota's case, central heating system, and then they're told not to use a broom to sweep up the broken light bulb as they could come in contact with mercury at a later time.

This should give Congress pause to think about this next rule that says if clothing comes in contact with a broken light bulb and the mercury, it must be disposed of immediately. Imagine that. Children or teachers or the janitorial staff would have to remove their clothing immediately, and we're told that you are not allowed to wash your clothes. That's what the EPA rules say. You're not allowed to wash your clothes. That won't do the trick because mercury fragments in the clothing might contaminate the washing machine and also pollute sewage.

Let's get this straight. Congress is worried about harming sewage and yet we're rushing to place these mercury light bulbs in our classrooms next to our children. That step alone should be a warning to the dangers of mercury-laden light bulbs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentlewoman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. BACHMANN. But the kicker of them all is the disposal process. Immediately a person must place all of the clean-up materials in an outdoor trash can or protected area for normal trash pickup. But make sure that you check with your local government.

In Minnesota, my home State, it does not allow for normal trash disposal for mercury. Instead, they require that broken and unbroken mercury bulbs be taken to a local recycling center.

There are so many rules that are contained on the EPA Web site that I don't have time to address them all, but while these clean-up guidelines are important and should be followed, the harm that just one broken light bulb can have on a child, senior citizen, or an animal is very real, which is why Congress should not embark on these fads.

I hope none of us will have to respond to the news story of a girl or a boy or a senior citizen or an animal who is poisoned by a broken mercury-laden light bulb. That would be horrible.

I speak today to alert this body and the American people of this yet considerable loss of liberty.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished ranking member from California (Mr. McKEON).

□ 1530

Mr. McKEON. I thank the gentleman for yielding and I rise in opposition to this rule.

Schools around the Nation are facing an immediate funding shortfall, but it's not a lack of funds for green facilities maintenance. Mr. Speaker, like the rest of us, they're struggling with gasoline prices.

For local school systems, energy represents a significant share of their budget. They pay for the fuel to operate the buses that drive children to and from school. They pay to heat their schools in the winter and cool them in the summer. They pay for electricity to light their classrooms and power their computers. And with the national average for a gallon of regular gasoline reaching \$3.98 today—now, that might have been at the start of debate. It could be \$3.99 or \$4 now the way it's going up. In California, it's much higher than this already—these energy costs are consuming an increasing share of overall school budgets.

For schools, rising energy costs don't stop with school buses and utilities. The cost of fuel makes almost everything more expensive, from books and supplies to the food that goes into school lunches. So, yes, our schools do have an immediate need, and we ought to be on the floor addressing that need today. We should be taking action on comprehensive energy legislation that will increase production, drive innovation, and promote conservation. Unfortunately, that's not what we're going to do today.

Instead, the House will consider a bill that fundamentally changes the Federal role in education. I'm talking about legislation that begins the process of Federalizing the building and maintenance of individual schools in communities across this Nation. Agree or disagree with what this bill is trying to accomplish, no one can deny that what's being proposed is a significant, perhaps even monumental, shift in education policy.

In keeping with the pattern established by the majority, it is no surprise then that this bill is being brought up with limited opportunity for debate and amendment, after being rushed through an abbreviated committee process.

Of the 20 amendments submitted by Republicans, just four were made in order. That's one in five.

Not surprisingly, members of the majority party fared a little better. Of the eight amendments they offered and did not withdraw, fully half of them were made in order. Several others were combined with amendments that were accepted or added to the manager's amendment, making sure that in the end virtually all of their concerns are going to be addressed.

We can do better than this. We should do better than this, but after a year-and-a-half under this iron-fisted majority, I know better than to expect better.

So much for the most open Congress in history. I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Ms. SUTTON. I continue to reserve my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my good friend from Florida for his leadership on this issue and so many others.

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor today. I wanted to talk about the amendments that I had offered to this bill that would have provided some accountability to the spending that's incorporated in this bill, but as we have heard, those amendments weren't made in order.

So, in addition to the majority not wanting to have accountability for the bill that we're talking about on school construction, the first time Federal moneys have been used for school construction, no accountability, what I thought I would do then is address the issue that we ought to be talking about today. That's the issue that we all heard about last week when we went home.

When I went home, what did I hear from my constituents? I didn't hear about school construction. I heard about gas prices. And I heard that people are tired, sick and tired, and fed up with inaction in Washington. They want solutions.

Mr. Speaker, there are three ways to address this issue. One is conservation, and we all can do more.

The second is to make certain that we put appropriate incentives in place for alternative fuels so that we can bridge to the next generation and American genius can be unleashed. This majority isn't doing anything about that.

But the way that we bridge to the next generation is to increase supply, and so I asked some folks on our side of the aisle to get the information that said what has the majority party, what have the Democrats, done in order to increase supply of American energy.

It won't surprise you, Mr. Speaker, to know that 91 percent of the folks on our side of the aisle, 91 percent, supported exploration in Alaska over the last 15 years; 86 percent on the other side opposed it to increase supply.

Coal-to-liquid technology, 97 percent on our side of the aisle supported increasing supply in coal-to-liquid technology; 78 percent on the other side opposed it.

How about oil shale exploration? Ninety percent on our side of the aisle support oil shale exploration increasing supply; 86 oppose it on the other side.

Deep sea exploration, Mr. Speaker, 81 percent on our side support it; 83 percent on the other side oppose it.

How about increasing refining capacity? There hasn't been a new refinery built in this Nation in over 30 years. Ninety-seven percent on this side of the aisle support it; 96 percent on the majority side oppose increasing refining capacity in vote after vote after vote.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents and I know Americans across this Nation are sick and tired, sick and tired of a majority that's keeping us dependent on Middle Eastern oil. So I call on this majority and I call on the Speaker to bring forward a positive bill that will increase conservation, increase incentives for alternative fuel, and make certain that we can use American resources, American energy for Americans.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues who may be listening to this debate that this rule and this bill are about repairing and improving our Nation's schools.

I also want to remind the people at home that, of course, those who are railing now about the effects of energy policy over the past 6 or so or 8 or 10 years were in charge, most of that time with a Republican President, and this is what we get.

So this Congress, of course, is a new majority, and we have taken bold steps to put incentives in place that will lead to historic change and will turn the corner to renewable sources of energy in this country being developed.

We have 30 million acres on which oil drilling can take place right now, and those are just sitting idle. Those on the other side of the aisle don't tell us the whole story when they're talking about these issues.

But I just want to repeat, I want to remind my colleagues who may be listening to this debate, that this rule and this bill is about the very important business of repairing and improving our Nation's schools.

With that, I reserve my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first it's important to set the record straight. Ten years ago, this Congress passed drilling in the ANWR, and it faced a Presidential veto by then-President Clinton, and imagine if it hadn't faced a veto how much of a difference we would have been able to make.

Now we're seeing the consequences of that, as Mr. PRICE of Georgia pointed out. Effort after effort that we've engaged in to try to increase the production of energy, the supply of energy has been opposed by the other side of the aisle and I think nowhere more dramatically than when we were able to pass legislation to have production in Alaska, and it was vetoed by the last President, a Democratic President.

So these things have to be put on the record, Mr. Speaker, because now with \$4 gas the record counts, and the record is of interest to all Americans, and it will be more and more of interest every day.

Mr. Speaker, back on April 24, 2006, just over 2 years ago, now-Speaker PELOSI issued the following statement:

"With skyrocketing gas prices it is clear that the American people can no longer afford the Republican rubber stamp Congress and its failure to stand up to Republican big oil and gas company cronies. Americans are paying \$2.91 a gallon on average for regular gasoline, 33 cents higher than last month, and double the price than when President Bush first came into office."

Mr. Speaker, most Americans would be happy if they were paying \$2.91 a gallon today. Yet here we are this week debating bills on green schools and watertrails network instead of working on legislation to reduce the price of gasoline and increase supply. Now, the price of gasoline is at \$4 gallon now.

Reinforcing the fact that the majority has yet to confront that issue, just over a month ago the newspaper *Investors Business Daily* in an editorial said that this Congress "is possibly the most irresponsible in modern history. This is especially true when it comes to America's dysfunctional energy policy."

[From *Investor's Business Daily*, Apr. 29, 2008]

CONGRESS VS. YOU

We've said it before, but we'll say it again: This Congress is possibly the most irresponsible in modern history. This is especially true when it comes to America's dysfunctional energy policy.

The media won't call either the House or the Senate on its failures, for one very obvious reason: They mostly share an ideology with the Democrats that keeps them from understanding how free markets and supply and demand really work. Sad, but true.

So we were happy to hear the president do the job, calling out Congress for its inaction and ignorance in his wide-ranging press conference Tuesday.

"Many Americans are understandably anxious about issues affecting their pocketbook, from gas and food prices to mortgage and tuition bills," Bush said. "They're looking to their elected leaders in Congress for action. Unfortunately, on many of these issues, all they're getting is delay."

Best of all, Bush didn't let the issue sit with just generalities. He reeled off a bill of particulars of congressional energy inaction, including:

Failing to allow drilling in ANWR. We have, as Bush noted, estimated capacity of a million barrels of oil a day from this source alone—enough for 27 million gallons of gas and diesel. But Congress won't touch it, fearful of the clout of the environmental lobby. As a result, you pay at the pump so your representative can raise campaign cash.

Refusing to build new refineries. The U.S. hasn't built one since 1976, yet sanctions at least 15 unique "boutique" fuel blends around the nation. So even the slightest problem at a refinery causes enormous supply problems and price spikes. Congress has done nothing about this.

Turning its back on nuclear power. It's safe and, with advances in nuclear reprocessing technology, waste problems have been minimized. Still, we have just 104 nuclear plants—the same as a decade ago—producing just 19% of our total energy. (Many European nations produce 40% or more of their power with nuclear.) Granted, nuclear power plants are expensive—about \$3 billion each. But they produce energy at \$1.72/kilowatt-hour vs. \$2.37 for coal and \$6.35 for natural gas.

Raising taxes on energy producers. This is where a basic understanding of economics

would help: Higher taxes and needless regulation lead to less production of a commodity. So by proposing "windfall" and other taxes on energy companies plus tough new rules, Congress makes our energy situation worse.

These are just a few of Congress' sins of omission—all while India, China, Eastern Europe and the Middle East add more than a million barrels of new demand each and every year. New Energy Department forecasts see world oil demand growing 40% by 2030, including a 28% increase in the U.S.

Americans who are worried about the direction of their country, including runaway energy and food prices, should keep in mind the upcoming election isn't just about choosing a new president. We'll also pick a new Congress.

The current Congress, led on the House side by a speaker who promised a "common sense plan" to cut energy prices two years ago, has shown itself to be incompetent and irresponsible. It doesn't deserve re-election.

Today, I will be asking each of my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question to this rule. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule to make it in order for the House to consider any amendment that would actually do something to reduce gas prices for consumers, such as H.R. 5905, the CARS Act, which would give commuters a tax break on their commuting expenses and require the Speaker of the House to submit a plan to lower gas prices.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment and extraneous materials immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I am so pleased that our colleague Dr. PRICE pointed out on issue after issue, whether it's ANWR exploration or coal-to-liquid or oil shale exploration or refinery increased capacity or on the issue of nuclear power. There is a strong environmental movement in France, but over 80 percent of their electricity is generated from nuclear power. Yet we haven't built a nuclear power plant in this country in over 30 years.

It's time to face the issue of energy independence in this country.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it's interesting that my colleagues on the other side railed against this legislation in the name of energy.

It doesn't do a lot of good to pump more energy into these schools, more air conditioning into these schools, more heat into these schools when the schools are such inefficient users of energy. It makes no sense to pump more and more electricity into the schools, to use lighting that's outdated, outmoded, harmful to the learning of these children.

The purpose of this legislation is to take a major institution in our country, our elementary secondary education system, and have the Federal Government lend some support to local efforts that are struggling now, trying to accelerate their programs to cut their energy costs in the running of their schools.

That's what this bill allows us to do. It allows us to put in place as they renovate, as they repair, as they remodel these schools, trying to recover, as all businesses are all across the country, as homeowners are all across the country, to reduce their energy costs. It allows us to partner up with them and to provide some assistance in doing that.

It's rather interesting that all they can talk about on the other side is somehow that they didn't get to go to Alaska. If they'd gone to Alaska, it probably would have made a penny or 2 cents or 3 cents a difference in a gallon of gasoline today.

But the fact of the matter is why would you go to Alaska and put it into cars that are getting 12 and 13 miles a gallon? But you never went to the question of efficiencies. You never went to the question of better automobiles.

We did. The first time in 30 years, this Congress improved the mileage standard for automobiles. Just think if we had done it when George Bush said he wanted it done. Today, it would have been an entire different industry.

But no, you listened to the oil industry and you listened to the automobile industry. Well, listen to them today as the chairman of General Motors has to admit that they didn't see it coming, they didn't see it was going to happen. They laid off 20,000 workers. They shut down four plants making SUVs and trucks. Why are we listening to those people?

If we continue to listen to them, we'll be the only people in the world that are listening to them. They've made one bad business decision, one bad energy decision after another for the last two decades, and it cost them almost 450,000 jobs to the workers. It cost them market share, it cost them productivity, it cost them profit. Now what are they doing? They're trying to play catch-up.

Well, we don't think the school districts in this country should play catch-up like General Motors. We think the school districts in this country ought to have an opportunity to make these facilities more efficient in the use of the energy, more efficient in the conservation of energy so that they can come into the modern age and they can make the changes that all of the studies indicate to us not only will save them energy, not only will make the facilities safer, cleaner and better for the learning environment that these children need, it will also dramatically change the cost of running these school districts.

It's happening, but too many school districts in too many areas don't have

sufficient funds. We think the Federal Government ought to put its shoulder to the wheel and help these school districts conserve their energy.

□ 1545

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to speak against this rule and against this bill in itself.

First off, this is not a Federal responsibility, this is a State and local responsibility. And to the extent that we spend Federal taxpayer dollars, this isn't the Federal Government doing this, there is no such thing as the Federal Government doing this; this is the Federal taxpayer doing this. So you've got taxpayers on one hand funding their local schools; you've got Federal taxpayers funding those same local schools. This is a wreck of bureaucratic nightmare. This should not happen.

We're not fully funding IDEA, we're not fully funding title I; this is just something new. So it's because it's new that we can get away with acting like this is something that's good, and it's not because we're not fully funding what we should be.

Electrical costs in our schools are very high, no doubt about it. And the truth of the matter is we can't conserve our way into lowering those electricity costs because electricity cost generation is going to continue to go up. And as this majority continues to restrict the growth in clean coal burning technology, as they continue to restrict the growth in nuclear power plants, they're going to continue to drive electricity costs higher and higher.

Now we all like wind, we all like solar, but the truth of the matter is growth in those alternatives cannot even keep up with the growth in the demand for electricity. As schools begin to quit going to field trips, as they begin to quit going to football games and quit going to things they're already telling us they're going to do because of gasoline costs and diesel costs being higher because of lack of supply, it's our responsibility to address the broader issue of energy and not school buildings, which is a local and State issue.

Mr. Speaker, I speak against this rule and against this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONAWAY. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. What would you prefer that they do, have the schools do nothing when they know that they have a waiver? Every business in America is investing in energy conservation.

Mr. CONAWAY. Reclaiming my time, what I would have them do is take the local responsibility of making these decisions on their own.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. This doesn't take anything away from local responsibility.

Mr. CONAWAY. Reclaiming my time, what I would have them do is take the responsibility themselves to make these very good decisions to create energy-efficient facilities. But it's their job, not the Federal taxpayer's job.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Again, Mr. Speaker, we're asking for a "no" vote on the previous question to be able to address the energy issue. If we're ever going to address it, it's time to start doing so with \$4 a gallon gasoline.

Members can take a stand against high fuel prices and insist that the energy issue be addressed seriously by voting "no" on the previous question. I encourage a "no" vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, as we lead this country in the 21st century, we must work creatively to form policies that address the intertwining nature of the challenges we face.

I've heard that this isn't important legislation from the other side of the aisle, and that is concerning to me because safe and healthy schools are important. Environmentally sustainable schools are important. Creating 100,000 jobs in this country is important. Acting to instill environmental stewardship in students and our youth is important.

One out of five Americans attends school each day. A 2006 report concluded that, despite significant State and local expenditures on school construction and renovation from 1996 to 2004, there continues to be millions of students in substandard and overcrowded school conditions. This bill will set our 60 million school children on a path to a better education and a healthier future by providing a Federal investment to help renovate, prepare, and modernize thousands of public schools.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we are tasked with finding solutions that are innovative and multifaceted, to secure a better future for America.

Part of that responsibility is ensuring that young Americans have access to safe, constructive environments to learn in.

H.R. 3021 will help give our children and grandchildren the sound, healthy classrooms they need and deserve. It is clear that our schools are aging and in need of repairs . . . repairs that must be made to allow students to focus on learning and reaching their full potential.

Not only will we be investing in future generations of Americans, we will provide thousands of much-needed, high-quality jobs.

With the bill before us today, we are taking steps that will help address so many of the challenges we face.

The improvements made to schools will encourage green building techniques and help reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. These standards will save school districts money on utilities for years to come.

In my district, the Natomas Unified School District, the state's only "Climate Action Leader," recently received the Clean Air "Government Award" for its dedication to air quality and energy-saving techniques. It is innovative approaches like this that H.R. 3021 will encourage across the country.

I cannot help but think of my grandchildren, Anna and Robby; they are approaching school age, and I want them to be in a healthy environment that will enable them to reach their full potential.

I ask my colleagues to support the Rule and final passage of H.R. 3021.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1234 OFFERED BY MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution or the operation of the previous question, it shall be in order to consider any amendment to the bill which the proponent asserts, if enacted, would have the effect of lowering the national average price per gallon of regular unleaded gasoline. Such amendments shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for thirty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 of rule XXI. For purposes of compliance with clause 9(a)(3) of rule XXI, a statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the proponent of such amendment prior to its consideration shall have the same effect as a statement actually printed.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the

vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. SUTTON. I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered, and motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 1343 and H.R. 5669.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 196, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 370]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Boyd (FL)	Cohen
Ackerman	Boyd (KS)	Conyers
Allen	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Altmire	Braley (IA)	Costa
Arcuri	Brown, Corrine	Costello
Baird	Butterfield	Courtney
Baldwin	Capps	Cramer
Barrow	Capuano	Crowley
Bean	Carnahan	Cuellar
Becerra	Carney	Cummings
Berkley	Carson	Davis (AL)
Berman	Castor	Davis (CA)
Berry	Cazayoux	Davis (IL)
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Davis, Lincoln
Bishop (NY)	Childers	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Clarke	DeGette
Boren	Clay	DeLauro
Boswell	Cleaver	Dicks
Boucher	Clyburn	

Dingell	Levin	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Lipinski	Ryan (OH)
Doyle	Loeb	Salazar
Edwards	Lofgren, Zoe	Sánchez, Linda
Ellison	Lowe	T.
Ellsworth	Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta
Emanuel	Mahoney (FL)	Sarbanes
Engel	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Markey	Schiff
Etheridge	Marshall	Schwartz
Farr	Matheson	Scott (GA)
Fattah	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Foster	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano
Frank (MA)	McCollum (MN)	Sestak
Giffords	McDermott	Shea-Porter
Gonzalez	McGovern	Sherman
Gordon	McIntyre	Sires
Green, Al	McNerney	Skelton
Green, Gene	McNulty	Slaughter
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Solis
Hare	Michaud	Space
Harman	Miller (NC)	Speier
Hastings (FL)	Miller, George	Spratt
Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell	Stark
Higgins	Mollohan	Stupak
Hinchey	Moore (KS)	Sutton
Hinojosa	Moore (WI)	Tanner
Hirono	Moran (VA)	Tauscher
Hodes	Murphy (CT)	Taylor
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Thompson (CA)
Holt	Murtha	Thompson (MS)
Honda	Nadler	Tierney
Hooley	Napolitano	Towns
Hoyer	Neal (MA)	Tsongas
Inslee	Oberstar	Udall (CO)
Israel	Obey	Van Hollen
Jackson (IL)	Oliver	Velázquez
Jefferson	Ortiz	Visclosky
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Walz (MN)
Johnson, E. B.	Pascarella	Wasserman
Jones (OH)	Pastor	Schultz
Kagen	Payne	Waters
Kanjorski	Perlmutter	Watson
Kaptur	Peterson (MN)	Watt
Kennedy	Pomeroy	Waxman
Kildee	Price (NC)	Weiner
Kilpatrick	Rahall	Welch (VT)
Kind	Rangel	Wexler
Klein (FL)	Reyes	Wilson (OH)
Kucinich	Richardson	Woolsey
Langevin	Rodriguez	Wu
Larsen (WA)	Ross	Yarmuth
Larson (CT)	Rothman	
Lee	Roybal-Allard	

NAYS—196

Aderholt	Culberson	Herger
Akin	Davis (KY)	Hill
Alexander	Davis, David	Hobson
Bachmann	Davis, Tom	Hoekstra
Bachus	Deal (GA)	Hulshof
Barrett (SC)	Dent	Inglis (SC)
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Issa
Barton (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (IL)
Biggert	Donnelly	Johnson, Sam
Blibray	Doolittle	Jones (NC)
Bilirakis	Drake	Jordan
Bishop (UT)	Dreier	Keller
Blackburn	Duncan	King (IA)
Blunt	Ehlers	King (NY)
Boehner	Emerson	Kingston
Bonner	English (PA)	Kirk
Bono Mack	Everett	Kline (MN)
Boozman	Fallin	Knollenberg
Boustany	Feeney	Kuhl (NY)
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	LaHood
Broun (GA)	Flake	Lamborn
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Lampson
Brown-Waite,	Fortenberry	Latham
Ginny	Fossella	LaTourette
Buchanan	Fox	Latta
Burgess	Franks (AZ)	Lewis (CA)
Burton (IN)	Frelinghuysen	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Garrett (NJ)	Linder
Calvert	Gerlach	LoBiondo
Camp (MI)	Gilchrest	Lucas
Campbell (CA)	Gingrey	Lungren, Daniel
Cannon	Gohmert	E.
Cantor	Goode	Mack
Capito	Goodlatte	Manzullo
Carter	Granger	Marchant
Castle	Graves	McCarthy (CA)
Coble	Hall (TX)	McCaul (TX)
Cole (OK)	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Conaway	Hayes	McCrery
Crenshaw	Heller	McHenry
Cubin	Hensarling	McHugh

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 24, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 372]

YEAS—393

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt

DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)

King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmuter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy

Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz

Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt

Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—24

Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Campbell (CA)
Duncan
Flake
Franks (AZ)

Hensarling
Jordan
Lamborn
Marchant
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Paul

Andrews
Baca
Cardoza
Chabot
Filner
Gallegly

Rush
Saxton
Shuler
Udall (NM)
Wilson (NM)

NOT VOTING—16

Gillibrand
Hunter
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Lewis (GA)
Pryce (OH)

Pence
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Stearns
Tancredo
Weldon (FL)

□ 1634

Mr. BURTON of Indiana changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act, and for other purposes.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 372, I was unable to vote because of pressing business with my constituents in my home district. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

POISON CENTER SUPPORT, ENHANCEMENT, AND AWARENESS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5669, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5669.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 10, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 373]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson

Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxy
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley

Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslie
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary

Miller, George	Rodriguez	Stearns
Mitchell	Rogers (AL)	Stupak
Mollohan	Rogers (KY)	Sullivan
Moore (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Sutton
Moore (WI)	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Moran (VA)	Roskam	Taylor
Murphy (CT)	Ross	Terry
Murphy, Patrick	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Murphy, Tim	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Murtha	Royce	Thornberry
Musgrave	Ruppersberger	Tiahrt
Myrick	Ryan (OH)	Tiberi
Nadler	Ryan (WI)	Tierney
Napolitano	Salazar	Towns
Neal (MA)	Sali	Tsongas
Neugebauer	Sánchez, Linda	Turner
Nunes	T.	Udall (CO)
Oberstar	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Obey	Sarbanes	Van Hollen
Olver	Scalise	Velázquez
Ortiz	Schakowsky	Visclosky
Pallone	Schiff	Walberg
Pascarella	Schmidt	Walden (OR)
Pastor	Schwartz	Walsh (NY)
Payne	Scott (GA)	Walz (MN)
Pearce	Scott (VA)	Wamp
Perlmutter	Serrano	Wasserman
Peterson (MN)	Sessions	Schultz
Peterson (PA)	Sestak	Waters
Petri	Shays	Watson
Pickering	Shea-Porter	Watt
Pitts	Sherman	Waxman
Platts	Shimkus	Weiner
Pomeroy	Shuster	Welch (VT)
Porter	Simpson	Weldon (FL)
Price (GA)	Sires	Weller
Price (NC)	Skelton	Westmoreland
Putnam	Slaughter	Wexler
Radanovich	Smith (NE)	Whitfield (KY)
Rahall	Smith (NJ)	Wilson (OH)
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Wittman (VA)
Regula	Snyder	Wolf
Rehberg	Solis	Woolsey
Reichert	Souder	Wu
Renzi	Space	Yarmuth
Reyes	Speier	Young (AK)
Reynolds	Spratt	Young (FL)
Richardson	Stark	

NAYS—10

Broun (GA)	Paul	Shadegg
Duncan	Pence	Tancredo
Flake	Poe	
Kingston	Sensenbrenner	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Gillibrand	Rush
Baca	Hunter	Saxton
Campbell (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Shuler
Cardoza	(TX)	Udall (NM)
Chabot	Lewis (GA)	Wilson (NM)
Filner	Meeks (NY)	
Galleghy	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1644

Mr. POE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PUTNAM changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 373, I was unable to vote because of pressing business with my constituents in my home district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3021.

□ 1645

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3021) to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants and low-interest loans to local educational agencies for the construction, modernization, or repair of public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities, and for other purposes, with Ms. BORDALLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I rise in very strong support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Facility Act, legislation that would invest in modernizing public schools across the country.

This legislation is an example of how well-crafted public policy can address a number of key challenges all at the same time. This bill has something in it for improving the education of our children, improving our economy, and improving the environment.

First, this legislation will help improve student achievement by providing more children and teachers with a modern, safe, healthy, clean, place for learning. Second, this legislation will give a boost to our economy by injecting demand into a faltering U.S. construction industry. And, third, this legislation will make our schools part of the solution to the global warming crisis by encouraging more energy efficiency as well as the use of renewable energy resources.

Any one of these three reasons alone would be enough to support this bill; but when you put all three of them together, this is a clear win for our children, for our communities, for workers, and for our planet.

For children and teachers, unfortunately, the reality is that in too many of our communities the schools are lit-

erally crumbling. In 2000, The National Center of Education Statistics said it would take \$127 billion to bring schools into good condition, including that 75 percent of the schools were in various stages of disrepair. The American Society of Civil Engineers gave U.S. schools a D for national infrastructure report card. Just last month, the 21st Century School Fund called for a \$140 billion Federal investment in school facilities to bring all school districts up to the level of the highest income districts followed by ongoing annual Federal investment.

The fact of the matter is that those children who have the most difficult time receiving an education are receiving that education in some of the worst schools in this Nation. This is an effort for us simply to partner with local school districts on a formula basis so that they can then carry out their plans to renovate, to repair, to remodel existing schools so that they can save energy, they can provide better lighting and a better atmosphere for the schools to learn.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I stand in opposition to H.R. 3021, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The name of this bill is a mouthful but seems harmless enough, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act. It sounds like a program to ensure good schools, safe schools, environmentally friendly schools. It sounds pretty good to me. It is when we look a little closer that the real goal becomes clear. This is a bill that puts us on a path toward Federalizing the building and maintenance of our Nation's schools. It is about feeding bigger government and giving Washington more control over what happens in States and local communities. We are talking about an estimated \$20 billion over the next 5 years handed out to States and schools so that we can exercise control over how they build their schools.

Maybe a school has a leaky roof. The Federal Government is happy to pay to get it fixed; but instead of spending \$1,000 on a repair, we tell the school it has to spend \$100,000 on a new roof that meets our hand-picked environmental standards. And Big Brother doesn't stop there. We also link this funding to the Depression-era Davis-Bacon Act, meaning that construction projects under this bill must pay so-called prevailing wages. The problem is, prevailing wage calculations are critically and fundamentally flawed. Sometimes they are higher than market rates and other times they are lower.

Take plumbers, for instance. I have a chart here that shows in a sampling of cities plumbers paid Davis-Bacon wages could be paid anywhere from 70 percent below the market rate to 77 percent above the market rate. Davis-Bacon requirements drive up the cost of Federal projects by 10, 15, 20 percent,

and sometimes more. These are costs that get passed on to the taxpayers. Moreover, these requirements force private companies to do hundreds of millions of dollars of excess administrative work each year.

So already we are talking about a new \$20 billion program to fund an inefficient construction mandate that allows bureaucrats here in Washington to tell our neighborhoods and small towns and big cities exactly how their school buildings should be built, from the materials they use to the contractors they hire.

Madam Chairman, I would like to know where that \$20 billion is going to come from. When we were in the majority, we heard no end to the complaints from the other side of the aisle that we were underfunding No Child Left Behind and the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. I am proud of our record of strong support for these programs, but it is true that they are not funded at their authorized level. It was true when Democrats were in the majority up until 1995, it was true when we were in the majority even though we doubled the payments there, and it is still true today with Democrats back at the helm. The reality is that neither party has funded these programs at their authorized maximum.

If we have \$20 billion to spend on our schools, shouldn't we invest that in keeping the promises we have already made? We are looking at \$6.4 billion authorized for this program next year alone. Do you know what that could do for title I or IDEA? We could increase special education funding by almost 60 percent in 1 year. We could bring title I funding to more than \$20 billion.

I don't know whether we have the money to spend on this program; in fact, I think we probably don't. But if we have it, we have a duty to spend it on programs that help improve academic achievement for disadvantaged children.

I also think it is ironic that we are here today proposing a program to build more schools when districts around the country are struggling just to pay for the fuel it takes to transport children and operate, heat, and cool the schools we already have. Like the rest of the country, our schools are being squeezed by the high price of gasoline. Rising fuel prices are taking a real toll on our Nation's schools, just as on our Nation's families and individuals.

Beyond diesel fuel and heating oil, schools are faced with higher supply costs, fewer field trips, and costlier school lunches. First it was community colleges forced to move to a 4-day school week; now, even K-12 school systems are reducing the number of school days because of the pain at the pump. Unfortunately, that is a problem for which the Democrats are offering no answers.

Madam Chairman, this is a bad program created based on a flawed premise. Yes, there is a need for school

construction and modernization. It is a need that is best handled at the State and local level where they can be responsive to each community's unique needs. The Federal role in education has been limited to target interventions that help provide a more level playing field for children who might otherwise be left behind. That is where our focus should remain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to say that it is interesting that again they talk about the increased energy costs for schools. And at the same time that we are considering legislation which is designed to lower those energy costs for schools, they are arguing against the passage of this legislation.

This is a modest effort by the Federal Government to help these schools get on with the refurbishing, the repair, and the renovation of these schools so that they will lower their energy costs, whether it is heating or air conditioning, so that they can then put that money back into the educational program.

Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER), the author of this legislation who understands the importance of this contribution to the education of our children at the local level.

Mr. CHANDLER. Madam Chairman, I am very proud to be here today to introduce the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act, authorizing almost \$7 billion for our struggling schools.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to our cosponsors on this bill, in particular Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LOEBACK, but especially Chairman MILLER who has done an incredible job as chairman of the Education and Labor Committee and I very much appreciate what the gentleman from California has done on this bill.

Where children learn has a large impact on what they learn, and the evidence is undeniable. The U.S. Department of Education tells us that modern, functional school facilities are truly important for effective student learning. Consequently, it is unacceptable that some of our children spend their days in buildings with faulty wiring, leaking roofs, lead paint, and asbestos.

In 1995, the GAO found that schools were in desperate need of repairs totaling \$112 billion. Over a decade later, the need is even greater. Each day we are competing on a global stage and not always winning that competition, and investing in the education of our children at home is the key to staying in the game. We are spending hundreds of billions of dollars in Iraq. Surely, surely we can invest less than \$7 billion in the future of our children and the future of our country.

This bill is a home run. It will give much needed money to our schools struggling with huge budget deficits,

while encouraging energy efficiency and creating jobs for Americans that cannot be shipped overseas. Today, I urge you, Democrats and Republicans alike, make this important investment in our schools, in our children, and in our future.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I am privileged now to yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the ranking member on the subcommittee over K-12 education, 3 minutes.

Mr. CASTLE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for yielding. Let me try to put this in perspective.

We are talking about Federal dollars here. We have never at the Federal Government level funded school construction. Perhaps in emergency situations, but other than that, we have not.

□ 1700

We do have certain responsibilities that we do need to fund, and one of those is clearly under the No Child Left Behind. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is title I. The ranking member from California has already pointed this out.

But the bottom line is that when you look at the funding which we have here, which fundamentally is \$6.4 billion in title I. There's another \$100 million in title II of this legislation. But if you take that \$6.4 billion and you add it to title I, you get very close to that amount of money that we have already authorized in our committee under the jurisdiction of all of us involved with this committee.

I think we clearly recognize the importance of title I. It brings in the teachers, it brings in the help. It brings in the people who are going to help our children in schools which are most in need of money. And we would get at least a lot closer to the \$25 billion. Right now we only have \$13.9 billion appropriated.

And then you look at IDEA. Everybody here, Republicans and Democrats alike have fought hard in recent years to increase IDEA to help our children with disabilities, the Individual Disabilities Education Act, and with that extra \$6.4 billion, as this chart shows, IDEA could be funded at \$7.3 billion, getting very close to the 40 percent requirement in the statute with respect to where we should be with helping those children with disabilities.

My concern is, where are we spending our Federal money?

My other concern is, and I hope my friends in the Blue Dogs are listening to all of this, but my other concern is we are opening a door here. We are opening a door which is very large, and we're opening it somewhat wide. You haven't even begun to see where we're going to go. The \$6.4 billion for fiscal year 2009 is followed by whatever sums thereafter, that's going to go up dramatically very, very quickly, in my judgment. And when all of the local entities realize that perhaps they can

come to the Federal Government and get money, maybe they'll try to whittle down the title III of this so they don't have to worry about the green aspect of it quite as much, and they're going to go for more money. That's going to be the key to it and you're going to see huge increases. I think the 6.4 is merely a beginning. And all this is going to, in my judgment, take away from whatever money is needed for education.

Yes, we can argue that the money could come from war or this or whatever it may be. It's not that simple. The bottom line is that people are going to look at education, and I'm afraid they're going to say, we're putting it in construction, therefore we can't put it in title I, we can't put it in IDEA, and I think that would be a mistake.

I believe that this bill is well-intended, and I agree with everything that's being said on the other side about the good it can do as far as schools are concerned. But I have a strong disagreement with where the Federal Government should be in this. I think it should be a local and State issue in terms of construction, and we need to fund those things that we have agreed to fund. We need to fund title I. We need to fund IDEA. We do not need to open up a whole new source of funding that we simply cannot afford at this time.

So I would encourage defeat of the legislation and, hopefully, we can make sure that we're funding programs we should be funding in education.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education, and an incredible advocate for the Federal role in school construction for many, many years, and a coauthor of this legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation.

I was pleased to join Mr. CHANDLER and Chairman MILLER in introducing H.R. 3021, and to work with my chairman and Representatives LOEBSACK, ANDREWS, HARE, HOLT and MCCARTHY to introduce the committee substitute. I especially acknowledge Mr. LOEBSACK's great depth of knowledge and the perseverance he has brought to this bill.

This legislation will bring critically needed resources to schools around the country to provide students, teachers, principals and others with safe, healthy, modern, energy efficient and environmentally friendly learning spaces, and will help our local, State and national economies by creating jobs for thousands of workers to build these improvements.

Some years ago, Madam Chairman, in my district, a Federal judge ordered a jail to be torn down because it was unfit for human habitation. Yet, many

local educators told me that jail was in better shape than some of the schools where they work so hard every day on behalf of their students. By providing the resources to ensure that situation never happens again, this bill would send children the message that we truly value every one of them.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. McKEON. I yield now to the gentleman from Utah, a member of the committee, Mr. BISHOP, 3 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. When this bill was originally introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, it would have required the Department of Energy to conduct a study of needs nationwide and then provided grants to meet those needs.

This doesn't quite do it. There have been no studies. NCE did one about 8 years ago which talked on a regional basis but not anything more specific. Another study was done about 3 years ago, and instead of trying to identify construction needs, this bill tracks money based on title I spending, which simply asks the question, is there a connection between construction needs and the distribution formula in this particular bill? If not, and this bill escapes, we will be coming back repeatedly with ideas that we need to tweak this or that in the effort to create some kind of fairness for the future.

At the committee I raised the question, because my State has an equalization formula, not just for maintenance and operation which is programmed, but also for capital outlay. And I asked how this bill would impact my State and I was told we would find that out; get back with you. That still has yet to happen.

So let me try and tell you what this particular bill would do in my State as it relates to how we fund construction needs within a State. The State of Utah has two different categories, historically. First of all, we have continuing school building aid which basically went for areas that were overcrowded, where there was a surge of students creating crowded school conditions.

We also had a category that we funded which was continuing. I'm sorry. Let me switch that around. Continuing was for overcrowded. Critical school building aid was for those districts that happened to have all their buildings coming of age at the same time and needed an infusion of cash.

We then equalized the formula so that districts in the State of Utah were given State money, in addition to what they could raise locally, to meet these particular needs.

So I simply went through the formula that this bill would equate, and what would it do in the State of Utah. This is the bottom line. The districts that have continuing school building needs, overcrowded, would not get money from this formula. The districts that have critical school building needs, which simply means the age of

their buildings are all coming together at the same time, would not get money from this formula.

Indeed, the districts that get money from this formula are the ones in the State of Utah that do not have the construction needs. And that's a simple problem with this bill.

If we had gone along with what Congressman CHANDLER had originally established and tried to establish a criteria of where this money would go, there would be some logic to it. There is no logic. We are simply throwing money at a target that is constantly on the move.

Satchel Paige used to talk to young pitchers and say, "Just throw strikes. Home plate don't move."

Well, in this particular bill, we can't throw strikes because not only is home plate moving, it doesn't even exist. And that is a key problem with what we are trying to accomplish in this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have one other issue as well. We have talked, both in committee, the Rules Committee and I'm going to bring it up here on the floor, of the issue of charter schools. The committee has stated as their policy they wish to have charter schools treated fairly in this particular bill.

If a charter school is, of itself, a local education agency, the language in this bill covers charter schools and they will be treated fairly. Unfortunately, if a charter school is part of a different local education agency it does not guarantee in the language of the bill that that charter school will be treated fairly.

We have examples, anecdotal I admit, but anecdotal from coast to coast in this Nation, of charter schools who were not treated fairly by local education agencies. And unless specific language is placed in this bill, it does not guarantee that will happen.

I appreciate the chairman of the committee adding new language in a manager's amendment that will try and make a study of this to see if they can report back. But the bottom line is simply this. Despite our statement that we want charter schools to be treated fairly, the language of our bill is a gaping loophole that does not meet that if the charter school is not part of the LEA, and I would hope, I would certainly hope that the chairman or the sponsors would guarantee that they would continue to work on this issue to make sure that this is given out in a fair and equitable manner because we want fairness and logic. It doesn't exist in the distribution formula in this particular bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK), a member of our committee and a primary sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for his really great work on this legislation. I also want to thank Mr. CHANDLER for his commitment to this issue, and Mr. KILDEE, of course, for his longstanding work on this issue, and for his partnership in offering the substitute amendment to this bill during committee mark-up.

Mr. KILDEE's and my amendment combined important provisions from Mr. CHANDLER's legislation and provisions from my own legislation, the Public School Repair and Renovation Improvement Act and the Green School Improvement Act, and it also contained suggestions from many members, many other members of our committee who have prioritized green school construction over the years.

Schools across this country are deteriorating. Problems vary region by region, State by State and even district by district. I can see the problems in my own district in Iowa, especially in our rural schools. In Iowa, these schools serve close to 170,000 students.

This bill will help Iowa by directing over \$35 million to the State. This Federal investment will help leverage additional local dollars and create over 560 new jobs.

This bill also focuses on the importance of "greening" schools. Research demonstrates that green school technology can lead to increased health, learning ability and productivity. This includes improved test scores, attendance, teacher retention and satisfaction.

This legislation is a much needed investment in the education and safety of our students. Today, when we pass this bill, Congress will tell our students they matter. Congress will tell the American people that our economy and good jobs and good wages matter. And Congress will tell all of us that maintaining a healthy environment for all matters.

Madam Chairman, I urge the bill's passage.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time is left.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McKEON has 17 minutes. Mr. MILLER has 22 minutes.

Mr. McKEON. I am privileged to yield at this time to the gentlelady from Illinois, a member of the committee, Mrs. BIGGERT, 4 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to H.R. 3021. I support giving schools some Federal assistance when it comes to school construction. In fact, I've sponsored legislation in the past that would provide interest-free and low-interest loans to States and localities to support school construction, renovation and repair.

I represent some of the fastest growing communities in the country, and I know how school districts are constantly struggling to meet the growing demand for space and resources.

I also support the greening of our schools. I'm a cosponsor of H.R. 6065,

which will provide schools with small grants to make green and energy efficient improvements for their schools.

Much as I would like to join the supporters of H.R. 3021, let me remind them of the promises that we've already made to schools, but yet not met. In 1975, in passing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, or IDEA, Congress made a commitment to fund 40 percent of the cost of educating children with disabilities. Yet for fiscal year 2008, Congress appropriated only \$11.3 billion for this purpose, a mere 17 percent of the funds originally promised.

□ 1715

Is this an anomaly? Not at all. Congress has never delivered more than 18.5 percent of the money we promised for IDEA.

What I hear over and over again from teachers and school boards and administrators in my district is, When are you going to meet your commitments on IDEA and NCLB? How about meeting our commitments under No Child Left Behind? NCLB was authorized at \$25 billion, but Congress has just provided less than \$14 billion.

Despite these unmet commitments, Congress is positioned today to make another Federal commitment on school spending. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 3021 would increase discretionary spending by \$20.3 over a 5-year period. With this funding, we could meet our commitments to IDEA and increase funding for NCLB by \$5 billion over the next 5 years. I realize this is a back-of-the-envelope calculation. But I think it gives Members a better idea of what we could be accomplishing with this money.

As a former school board president, I well know that school construction is the responsibility of State and local governments. I support fiscally responsible proposals to facilitate State and local government investments in school infrastructure, but I cannot support authorizing billions of dollars in new spending when we cannot fulfill our current commitments to schools and children.

When Congress has fully funded IDEA and NCLB, I will be very happy to revisit this issue with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But until then, I think the top Federal priorities should be meeting our commitments and improving student achievement.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a member of our committee and a sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Chairman, I think there are obviously many of us that support H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act. In listening to the debate, I can only talk about a number of the schools that are in my district. I'm certainly someone who supports school funding

for IDEA, but if I have my children in the classrooms—or most of them are actually being taught in the hallways because they don't have the facilities to be able to do the teaching that they need to do. I know a number of my schools—if that was a business, you wouldn't be able to get anybody to work into that particular business.

What we're trying to do—and you have to look at things holistically. If we don't have good school facilities, how do we expect our teachers and certainly our students to learn, and what kind of message are we sending that we don't care enough about our children that we give them safe environments?

I can go into my schools in my district during the winter, and every window is wide open because the way the energy for the heating system is, it makes the classrooms too hot. The children can't concentrate. You go into one of my schools during the summertime when they're taking their final exams, and the classrooms are 110 degrees. How are our students supposed to be able to pass those tests and concentrate? None of us would work under those conditions. And yet we are asking our children to survive under those conditions.

We must look at how we're going to work to be able to educate our children for the global economy that we're looking forward to. But I believe very, very strongly we have to have a clean, safe environment. Go into our city schools. Come into my schools. Look at the amount of children that have asthma because the quality of the air is subnormal. A number of my schools in the last year had to be closed. So now we're putting our children in little trailers.

I don't understand this debate. This is something that many of our schools need, and as far as having Davis-Bacon, why should not we have prevailing wage for those that work in the community, pay the wages, and also have good construction done?

With that, I hope that we pass overwhelmingly this bill.

Mr. McKEON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a member of the committee and subcommittee Chair.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Chairman MILLER.

Madam Chairman, I'm pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century High-Performing Public School Facilities Act.

No child should be expected to learn in a crumbling school building. And this bill will give our Nation's schools the funds needed to repair and renovate their school building. That's very important because our children deserve the best opportunities in life, and that starts with a quality education in a safe building where students can focus on learning and teachers can focus on teaching.

This bill also encourages schools to make environmentally—green repairs. Schools in my district are making their facilities more environmentally friendly lately, and it's encouraging other schools to follow their lead because as our States face budget shortfalls and school districts deal with budget cuts, savings on energy costs will make a huge difference.

And it's a win-win. As a school shifts towards greening their school, students will learn about the process and the importance of preserving our environment. If you value our children, if you value our students, if you value their education and their educators, then show them; ensure their schools are the very best possible.

Support H.R. 3021.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HARE).

Mr. HARE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support today of H.R. 3021.

School districts around the country are struggling to find the money to pay for the most basic school repairs, let alone funding to upgrade school facilities to meet the needs of 21st century learners.

While school construction funding has traditionally been a State and local responsibility, the magnitude of the challenge warrants an increased Federal role, a role that could help schools such as Lewistown High in my district repair a leaky roof and replace World War II-era equipment that students are using for machine shop.

Madam Chairman, the bill before us authorizes \$6.4 billion to address unmet school construction needs. Additionally, the bill guarantees schools with the greatest need receive a minimum of \$5,000 for school construction projects.

As a member of the Green Schools Caucus, I'm pleased that this bill encourages schools to make energy-efficient improvements. By dedicating the majority of funds to green projects, H.R. 3021 will save schools an average of \$100,000 each year in energy costs alone—enough to hire two additional full-time teachers, purchase 5,000 new textbooks, or buy 500 new computers.

The deteriorating physical condition of public schools also presents an opportunity to stimulate our failing economy. A direct Federal investment in school construction will provide an immediate boost to our economy and create an estimated 100,000 jobs in the building trades hit hard in recent months.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 3021 comes as a much-needed response to crumbling school infrastructure, skyrocketing energy prices, and our declining economy. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. McKEON. I am privileged to yield at this time to the gentleman

from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) 3 minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Chairman, I apologize. I'm not a member of the committee involved. I was not really that alert to what this bill is, but listening to some of the debate, it just caused me some pause to reflect on maybe we found the answer to the question I keep being asked at my town hall meetings which is, How do you folks back there allow the budget to get so large? How do you get such deficit spending? What is going on back there?

Well, let's see. I just heard Members on the other side of the aisle say this is a Federal responsibility. In fact, I just heard this argued as a jobs program. This will stimulate the economy. Well, if that's the case, let's multiply it by 10. If this is going to create that many more jobs, let's ten 100 times. We will take care of all of the unemployment in America.

The idea that somehow we have the responsibility on the Federal level to now fund the programs for construction and air-conditioning and heating and so forth in schools, what is left for local taxpayers to do? Oh, I'm sorry. Local taxpayers are also the Federal taxpayers and the State taxpayers. I forgot that because we forget that here.

I just heard the gentleman previously on the other side say his school districts are strapped. They can't pay for it. But magically, we can pay for it here because I guess when my constituents get up in the morning they say, Well, this morning I'm a local taxpayer but at noon I will be a State taxpayer, tonight I will be a Federal taxpayer. I can't afford to pay for it in the morning; I'm not sure I can pay for it yet, but magically I can pay for it tonight because—well, I don't know. I guess this money comes from nowhere.

I mean, does anybody understand we're talking about a new program that's never existed before? But now, now the very future of the Republic depends on this program.

I heard another Member on the other side of the aisle say students can't learn when they're sweating, I guess. Well, I confess. I went to Catholic school. We didn't have air-conditioning in Southern California when it was 103, and it was hot. I remember sweating through my shirts, and it was uncomfortable. But give me a break. You're telling me that there's a Federal responsibility to put air-conditioning in every building that school kids are going to?

I would just ask the American people is this what they think the Federal Government is supposed to be doing? We should go around and find every single wrong thing or something that is not perfectly right and then the Federal Government is going to take care of it? Now, if that is the case, we will never come close to fiscal responsibility, and we're going to do this on top of the fact that we have mandatory

spending programs that, if you look at the payout, by the year 2042—and I know that's a long way away, but my grandkids will probably be concerned about it—as was stated not too long ago in testimony before one of our committees, if we continue spending the way it is, we will have no room for discretionary spending—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McKEON. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. As the head of OMB said at that time, including defense. That's the first time I ever heard of defense called discretionary.

But the point is there are certain responsibilities that are the Federal Government's. And I remember when we started the—I am old enough to remember that. I happened to be in Congress shortly after that when President Carter was elected and we established the Department of Education because we said the Federal Government ought to play a small role, small but important role in education.

Well, now if we're going to be responsible for construction for air-conditioning, for heating, for environmentally friendly construction, where does it end? I guess it ends at the taxpayers' pocketbook. But we just pretend that we're not taking from the pocketbook here because it is the Federal Government that doesn't cost anybody anything, but we are here to rescue everybody on the Federal level because they can't afford to pay for it at the local or State level.

Maybe that makes sense here in Washington, but I don't think it makes sense anywhere else. Maybe this is "Alice in Wonderland," but where I come from, people know that when you take a dollar out of their pocket, it's one less dollar they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes, and I want to ask him a question.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. You have to understand I'm not on the committee. So I'm not an expert on that. I'm just a regular Member of Congress who heard the debate as I was walking by.

Mr. McKEON. Let's talk about the things we deal with when we're not here in Congress. You have children. I have children. We have grandchildren. And I try to think about our children and grandchildren sitting at the kitchen table, and they have a little different rules that they have to operate under.

□ 1730

You know, we have a Federal responsibility that we have taken upon ourselves, and we will fund 40 percent of IDEA. We're up to about 17 percent. We said that we'll fund title I. We're way short of where we should be on that.

If, say, you have a grandson or granddaughter, maybe they've bought a motorcycle and they have a commitment to pay \$100 a month on a motorcycle. And maybe the daughter is going to school and has a commitment to pay a couple hundred dollars a month on that.

Family is sitting around and they say, you know, we're a little short, we don't have quite enough to pay the motorcycle bill this month, we don't have quite enough to pay the school bill this month, but why don't we go out and buy a motor home, because the family would benefit from that; it would be a good thing. We could have good quality time that we could spend together, and we don't have the money for that.

That's kind of what we're talking about here, isn't it?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Well, I would think so. I would think that it's certainly a greater priority to help that program, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, that we assume that as a responsibility, and I can argue back home that that is a shared Federal responsibility.

I don't think this bill rises to that level, and it seems to me if we use money for this and not for disabilities, aren't we shortchanging a program which really has a Federal responsibility for this? I know it sounds good because it's a new program.

I just noticed this. Maybe it's because I came back after 16 years. I find it's awfully easy to say billions and trillions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I found when I was gone for 16 years, I couldn't find billion and trillion so easy to say. But once we're here, it's awfully easy to say, and then it kind of masks the costs to the local taxpayer because the average person can't figure out what \$1 trillion is or \$1 billion because that's not within their area of experience.

But what it means, I would hope that folks back home would understand, if we were ever to talk to them about this, that this is coming out of their pocket. And if they believe they can't afford it back home, how can they afford it here, first?

Secondly, we have a commitment to programs like those for children with disabilities. Shouldn't we try and fund that to a higher level first before we start on this path to a new program?

Again, I'm not a member of the committee, and I know the gentleman has served on the committee. But that's a simple question.

Mr. MCKEON. We would love to have you on the committee, and I think that you're asking the right questions.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I'm not sure the chairman of the committee shares that sentiment, but I appreciate that, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

It's wonderful to listen to this conversation among two people talking about fiscal responsibility back and forth to one another. When the Bush administration came into office, they were given a \$5 trillion surplus. Now, 8 years later, it's a \$9 trillion deficit. And in that time, they never found the way to fund title I. They never found the way to fund IDEA. And yet, somehow, they were fiscally responsible, and now they've run this economy and this country into a ditch, with \$9 trillion of debt in 8 short years, and they inherited a \$5 trillion surplus.

Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), a member of the committee.

Mr. COURTNEY. Just to follow up on the chairman's remarks, it sounds like crocodile tears to hear people talking about underfunding IDEA and title I when last December we had a chance to override the President's veto of the education spending bill, which would have put a serious commitment by this Chamber towards those programs which, indeed, have been underfunded for far too long, but unfortunately, too many Members on the other side of the aisle upheld the President's veto and broke, again, the promises to local communities to pay for Federal mandates.

We have a national challenge facing this country, a national energy challenge, national education challenge, and that's what this national bill is focusing on.

In Connecticut, the Eastern Connecticut State University Institute for Sustainable Energy did an inventory of school buildings a couple of years ago. They found that 90 percent of the buildings were constructed before 1978, completely energy inefficient. If we could get to an Energy Star rating of 50, which is a very modest rating, we would save 40 percent, not 20 percent, but 40 percent energy costs, which is precious dollars for local communities that are distressed and don't have a property tax base to pay for that kind of investment.

This program is focused with a title I formula to needy school districts. We're not just taking dollars and throwing them up in the air across the United States of America. We are helping the communities that need the help and can't afford to invest in green technology.

We have districts in my part of Connecticut, Quaker Hill Elementary School, that are making that type of investment, but we need to help the districts that can't afford to do it.

That's why, with a title I-based formula, this legislation will accomplish that task. I urge the Chamber's full support.

Mr. MCKEON. I notice the chairman has left, but I wanted to just correct the record a little bit.

I've been here 16 years. I know he's been here over 30 years. But when we won the majority in 1994, at that point IDEA was funded at about \$2 billion. It was passed in 1976.

At the time, we made a commitment, those who were in the Congress at the time made a commitment, that the Federal level would be funded at 40 percent. At that time in 1976, \$2 billion would have funded at 40 percent. The Democrats were in charge from 1976 to 1994. They got it from a few hundred million up to \$2 billion in that time.

We won the majority in 1994, and we increased the funding from \$2 billion up to over \$10 billion in the following 12 years.

Now, to go back to talk about the surplus and the deficit. In 1994, we ran on the Contract With America, and we made a pledge to the American people that if we were given a chance, given the majority, we would balance the Federal budget in 7 years. Actually, we did it in 4 years. That's how we got that surplus.

But then in 2000, President Bush came in. There was a recession when he took office. We had 9/11 in 2001, which took us into a war footing, and you know, when you're at war, you spend more money, and that's how we've gotten the deficit.

But all of that aside, back to the basic premise of why we should be working to fully fund IDEA. What a problem that is to not provide fully funding for these children that need help with their special disabilities. We made a strong commitment. We took it from the 7 percent that they were funding it when they were in the majority, and they had been there for 18 years prior to that. We had 12 years. We got it up to over 17, 18 percent in that period of time.

So I don't think if you want to talk about commitment and who was putting the money where, we were doing it. All we're saying now is if they can find another \$6 billion, why not put it to the children with disabilities rather than fund a brand new program that really is the State and local responsibility.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, we're all concerned with fiscal responsibility, but I can recall a tough political vote I took the first year of President George W. Bush. That was on about a \$2 trillion tax cut, \$2 trillion. That's \$2,000 billion. This bill will cost \$6.5 billion a year. That tax cut was \$2 trillion.

There's various ways we have to be fiscally responsible, and I submit that tax cut, in my humble opinion—and I voted “no” on it and went back home and faced some wrath, not that much, though—I voted “no” on that because I also have a sense of fiscal responsibility.

Now you talk about IDEA. I think you will concede that no one's been a stronger advocate of full funding for IDEA than myself.

Mr. McKEON. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDEE. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. McKEON. I would be happy to yield that. You're a man of conviction and I think you are a strong supporter of IDEA, and we've worked together well on these things in the past.

I just think right now we have kind of a divergence where we're talking about a new program that could be used to fully fund IDEA, and we just have a difference then on that opinion.

Mr. KILDEE. On that, let me indicate I have a list of groups here who support both full funding of IDEA and support this bill. I will just read a few of them: the American Federation of Teachers, the American Association of School Administrators, the Council of Great City Schools, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Parent-Teacher Association. So these are groups who support both full funding of IDEA and full funding of this.

With that, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of our committee. I thank the gentleman from California for his kind words.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Chairman, I thank Mr. KILDEE.

And to my friend from California, I would say if we wanted to use this time for a discussion of both fiscal responsibility and which side of the aisle has done better with respect to individuals with disabilities and title I, boy, that's an argument that we would gladly take on.

But that's not the topic here. The topic here is the green schools program, and energy costs are the second highest operating expenditure for schools after personnel costs.

The two gentlemen from California were talking about how this is wasteful spending. I'll tell you what's wasteful. About a third of those \$8 billion annually that schools spend on energy could be saved.

What this legislation does, it provides help for local schools and States to invest in energy-saving design and technology, which will provide not only better learning conditions but save billions of dollars.

So this actually is beneficial from a fiscal point of view, as well as an educational point of view.

Mr. McKEON. I yield myself 1 minute.

I just want to say that I don't think either of the two gentlemen from California used the term "wasteful" spending. We never meant for that. We never inferred that.

What we were talking about is it's a new program that is going to divert limited resources. The list that Mr. KILDEE read, all of those people that supported it, yeah, you know, a lot of people want to have more and more and more spending. The problem is, we do have limited resources. I could prob-

ably read you a list of people that say we should not have additional spending that's going to carry us more and more into deficit for new programs before we fund the programs that we've already committed to, and the gentleman said he would like to have the debate on that issue.

I had an amendment on that issue that was not given to me. I wasn't given the ability to discuss it on the floor because the Rules Committee, I guess, felt that it wasn't an important issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. McKEON. I yield myself an additional minute.

I did have an amendment saying that we should first spend the money for the title I. That was where the Federal Government first got involved, helping underprivileged children, close the gap between the minorities and those that were doing better in their school, 14 percent gap. And we have spent billions of dollars, over \$85 billion, to try to close that gap, and we haven't done it, and we're still short on that funding.

And then the disabilities, the students that we all feel need more help, why, if we can come up with another \$6 billion, don't we put the money for these children that need the help the most?

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for your leadership and your commitment to our country's children.

I rise today in strong support of this bill. Not only does it provide for the modernization and repair of our schools, but it also employs green building standards and encourages States to adopt forward-thinking, energy-efficient strategies.

And I must thank Chairman MILLER for this bill, and the committee, but also for including in the manager's amendment language that I authored that requires local education agencies to report on the number and amount of contracts awarded to small minority and women-owned and veteran-owned businesses.

As a longtime advocate of green jobs that will be fundamental to America's future economic competitiveness, I believe everyone must have the opportunity to benefit from the green economy supported by this language.

Let me just say that I firmly believe the American people would rather invest in their school children. And in listening to this debate, it's mind bog-

gling to hear the other side talk about resource allocation and priorities. I think the American people would rather send our children to decent schools rather than fund a war and an occupation in Iraq that did not have to be fought. Here we're talking about now another \$180 something billion plus another down payment of this occupation that the President wants. This could lead us up to, what, \$3 trillion in terms of the occupation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. KILDEE. I yield the gentlelady 30 additional seconds.

Ms. LEE. I just wanted to make this one point because I listened very closely to what the fiscal arguments were on this bill. And it's hard to believe that you continue to fund this occupation in Iraq, yet you talk about the fact that we don't have the resources to create schools worthy of our children.

So I think this is about priorities. And I hope that everyone on both sides will vote for this bill in a bipartisan fashion.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for yielding. I support this bill and hope we all vote for it.

Mr. KILDEE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman. And I thank him and Chairman MILLER for incorporating parts of my "Green Schools" bill in this legislation.

I just wanted to make two more points, that under this bill States must develop a database of energy usage in public school facilities. I'm really pleased that this includes language that requires schools to report on their carbon footprints.

Also, we've included a provision to ensure that veteran-owned businesses receive the same contracting preferences as minority and women-owned businesses. As the war continues to swell the veteran population, it's our duty to help to ensure that returning soldiers have jobs to return to.

This is good legislation. I urge its passage. I thank the gentleman for putting together such good legislation.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Facilities Act, which would authorize funding for modernization, renovation and repair projects in schools with poor building quality.

Students and teachers deserve a clean and safe environment to go to school. However, according to the Environmental Protection Agency, one-third of schools, which serve approximately 14 million students, are desperately in need of extensive repairs.

As a former high school teacher, I believe that it is crucial to ensure that the grants authorized under this legislation be available for schools in which

existing building conditions are putting the health and safety of students and faculty at risk.

Many schools suffer from inadequate ventilation. When combined with toxic substances, such as mold, asbestos and lead, this lack of ventilation can cause significant health problems. Students and teachers in schools with indoor air quality problems suffer from a range of health problems from headaches, fatigue, dizziness, nausea, to respiratory illness. Even more troubling, when indoor air pollutants accumulate in inadequately ventilated schools, the air can become carcinogenic.

In Arizona's Tempe Union High School District, where I taught for almost 30 years, Corona del Sol High School has an HVAC system in desperate need of replacement. According to the Arizona Republic, some within the Corona del Sol community have expressed illnesses ranging from allergies and asthma to tumors and cancers. The high school district is struggling to find funds to replace HVAC systems, and as a result the problems continue to persist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. KILDEE. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to thank Chairman MILLER for working with me to ensure that the grants pursuant to this legislation can be used to help schools make critical repairs to protect the health and safety of students and teachers due to building conditions. Students and teachers should never have to compromise their health and safety to attend school, and this legislation will help prevent this from happening.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, could I ask again how much time each side has remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) for his efforts to modernize technical schools.

Madam Chairman, faced with record gas prices and a dangerous dependence on foreign oil, we must harness new technology to meet our energy needs. To do this, we must prepare students of today to power the green collar workforce of tomorrow.

I am honored to have worked with Chairman MILLER and Mr. BAIRD to ensure funding for this act goes toward modernizing career and technical

schools, especially for the renewable energy industries. By giving technical schools a chance to modernize, we will help even more students become innovators, work together to end global warming, and bring green energy jobs to the American economy.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity. I want to speak very briefly about this bill. This is a very, very important bill. It is critical to the future of education of our young people.

Let me start out by letting you know how important this is to my State of Georgia, and especially the metro Atlanta area. The metro Atlanta area is the third fastest growing child population in this country. Some 120,000 school children will enter area schools over the next 5 years. They need additional space. They're meeting in trailers. They're meeting in broken down buildings. They need help.

Now, Madam Chairman, I just came from a trip from Afghanistan and Iraq, and I'm very proud to say our soldiers are doing a wonderful job and all of our contractors are doing a wonderful job. They come to tell us, oh, we're doing great, we're building these many schools, we're building these many hospitals, which is wonderful, but then to come back here and to see us crawling and falling back instead of going forward to do the same thing for our own people. Not since 2001, 7 years ago, was the last time we even gave direct Federal aid to the States and the counties of our Nation to build schools, to help repair schools.

This bill is important because not only does it build schools, it builds them in a way that helps our environment, it builds them in a way that preserves our energy, cuts down on emissions that help global warming. It is an effective measure, Madam Chairman. It is a bill we must pass, and the time to do it is now.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

(Mr. ETHERIDGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act.

Madam Chairman, as the only former State schools chief serving in Congress, I have always worked to be a voice for children and their schools.

One of the biggest challenges we face in my home State of North Carolina—and really across this country—is a lack of adequate facilities for learning to take place. We simply must make a commitment to get our children out of trailers and into quality classrooms.

You just heard my colleague talk about what we're doing overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan building schools.

If we can build them overseas, we certainly can build them here in the United States. This bill is an important first step toward improving our children's education.

We will need to follow the authorization of these grants with full funding in appropriations. And we need to ensure that local and State authorities can raise money in other ways, as would be provided by in the America's Better Classroom Act through interest-free bonds to build more schools. There really is no substitute for bricks and mortar when it comes to quality schools and meeting the educational goals of our community.

I applaud Chairman MILLER and Congressman CHANDLER for their leadership on this issue, and urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3021, to improve the quality of where our children go to school and help them to learn and to be able to compete in the 21st century.

The CHAIRMAN. Both sides now have 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, for our Nation's schools, the spike in energy prices means that it costs more to fuel the buses that carry children to and from school. It costs more to heat and cool their facilities. It costs more to buy books and supplies. It costs more to provide school lunches and snacks. The list goes on.

School budgets are being overwhelmed by rising energy costs, and they need relief. The majority refuses to unveil its commonsense plan to bring down skyrocketing gas prices. On January 4, 2007, when the Democrats took charge of this House, gas prices stood at \$2.33 a gallon. Seventeen months later, gas costs 71 percent more, and yet their plan remains a secret.

We're turning a blind eye to the burden of high energy costs in our Nation's schools, and instead taking up a bill that usurps State and local rights and responsibilities, undermines efforts to fund programs for disadvantaged children, imposes complex and costly requirements, and offers little more than a Band-Aid for the very real need for school construction and modernization.

Madam Chairman, I strongly oppose this legislation. Just yesterday we received a Statement of Administration Policy indicating that if this legislation were presented to the President, his advisers would recommend that it be vetoed.

The Federal Government has a role to play in education. That role is to provide support and assistance to ensure that all children are provided a quality education. It's to support the academic achievement for disadvantaged children, children with disabilities, and other at-risk students who might otherwise be left behind.

We all want our communities to have safe, modern, environmentally friendly

schools in which our children can live and thrive, but this bill is the wrong way to achieve that goal. States, local communities and the private sector are all actively engaged in the construction and maintenance of school facilities all around the country. At least \$20 billion is being spent by the States each year to build new schools and modernize those already in use.

If we have \$6.4 billion to invest in education next year, let's put it into programs that serve underprivileged and disadvantaged children. Programs are already there. Whether it's title I or IDEA or even Pell Grants to help low-income students attend college, there are existing programs that could use these resources to improve academic achievement and directly benefit those who need help most.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. May I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 2½ minutes remaining.

□ 1800

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chairman, in my congressional district, I have a wide range of schools. I have some schools that were built before I was born, and you can guess maybe how old those schools are. Some of them are in deplorable condition. Then I have some school districts which, thanks to the voters because they are a little better off, they bond and they have really up-to-date school buildings. I have been happy to have been at the ground breaking or the ribbon cutting for those buildings, and the people have certainly done well to bond themselves for that. But there are other school districts that are abjectly poor, their tax base is miserable, and the school buildings are miserable.

Children learn better in decent buildings. And human nature being what it is, good teachers to a great extent are more likely to stay in better buildings.

This bill was wisely based upon the title I formula so those schools that are really stricken in my district now would be able to apply for these grants and, under the title I formula, would be able to receive some Federal dollars to help them replace buildings which I say are worse off than a jail that was torn down in my district because a judge declared it unfit for human habitation.

This is a good bill. It will put dollars where they are most needed to help children learn better. We know they learn better in a better building. I urge support for this bill.

Mr. SPACE. Madam Chairman, the steel industry has a proud tradition in this country. For over 150 years, steel production has been an important symbol of American strength and a critical source of American jobs.

In recent decades, the American steel industry has faced an increasingly difficult land-

scape. Short-sighted free-trade agreements and illegal dumping policies set in place by foreign countries have placed American steel on an uneven playing field with foreign competitors. Facilities have been forced to close, at the expense of countless American jobs.

In no place is this change in the industry more apparent than in my home of Ohio. Both my father and my grandfather found gainful employment in steel mills that now lie vacant and unused. Without question, Appalachian Ohio has felt the burden of global shifts in the economy, and I worry about the future of the jobs that remain.

This amendment will ensure that American taxpayer dollars are used to support American industries and jobs. At a time when other countries like China are using questionable policies to develop an unfair advantage, there must be a mandate to use American steel with any federal funds. I am proud to lend my support to this amendment and the American steel industry.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Act.

It is high time that we include public schools on the list of critical infrastructure that requires significant Federal investment and support.

I would like to commend Congressman BEN CHANDLER of Kentucky and Chairmen MILLER and KILDEE for their leadership on this vital legislation.

Our public schools educate roughly 90 percent of children in the United States.

We are counting on our public schools to prepare the leaders and workforce of tomorrow. Yet according to several estimates the need for school construction and renovation is in the hundreds of billions of dollars—as much as \$322 billion according to analysis from the National Education Association.

Worse, the students in the areas where the need for school modernization is most acute are minority students who now represent 43 percent of the total student population. Improving school facilities is also about improving educational opportunities and equality.

I am especially pleased that the manager's substitute includes specific language regarding the renovation and improvement of science and engineering laboratories in our schools. 52 percent of school principals reported having no science laboratory facilities in a National Center for Education Statistics survey. Simply put, we can never succeed in our national imperative to improve our competitiveness in the STEM fields if our children do not have the opportunity to experience and practice science and engineering. I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Chairman KILDEE for working with me and my colleague from Vermont, Congressman PETER WELCH to include the important provision in the bill before us today.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 3021.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act. The bill authorizes \$6.4 billion for school construction projects for fiscal year 2009, and ensures that school districts will quickly receive funds for school modernization, renovation, and repairs. A majority of these funds must be used for projects that meet green building standards for energy efficiency and carbon footprint reduction.

This important bill will improve the health of our Nation on a variety of levels. As an economic stimulus, it will create jobs all across the Nation as local citizens join together to build and repair schools. The bill also improves the teaching and learning climate in America's schools by combating overcrowding, decreasing student and teacher sick days, and improving school air quality for our nation's 60 million school children. This legislation also improves energy efficiency by mandating the use of renewable resources in our schools. These same energy efficiencies will also play a positive role in combating global climate change by limiting the carbon emissions emitted by school buildings. Finally, the inclusion of Davis-Bacon protections ensures that workers will receive a fair and prevailing wage.

At a time when our economy is reeling, with unemployment and inflation on the rise, this bill will infuse our faltering job market with the resources it needs to flourish. This \$6.4 billion investment in our Nation's infrastructure will create 100,000 new design and construction jobs—4,041 of which will be located in Michigan. Citizens working in other sectors will also see an improvement in their financial stability, as property values improve in communities with these new schools.

The bill will also dramatically improve the teaching and learning climate for America's school children. We all know that children can't learn if they're sick. The average American school was built half a century ago. As a result, too many of our children attend overcrowded schools housed in buildings with leaky roofs, faulty electrical systems, and outdated technology. This tremendous investment in physical facilities would help alleviate these problems by repairing and removing infrastructure rife with black mold and asbestos.

Some may decry the spending associated with this bill. I however, see it as a smart investment that will pay out cost-saving dividends in the very near future. Green schools created by this bill will cost, on average, 2% more than conventional schools but provide financial benefits that are 20 times as large. This is enough savings to hire two additional full-time teachers in most communities.

Although not obvious at first, the bill will also play a substantial role in our nation's multifaceted response to the threat posed by global climate change. When one thinks about the causes of global warming, images of exhaust spewing SUVs and coal plants billowing out black smoke spring to mind. In fact, 39 percent of all green house gas emissions come from buildings—including many of our country's school buildings. The energy efficiency improvements that will be built into our schools will have an immediate impact on this front. Each green and energy efficient school will lead to annual emission reductions of 585,000 pounds of carbon dioxide.

Finally, I am happy to see that the bill will include Davis-Bacon protections to all grants for school modernization, renovation, and repair projects. The inclusion of these protections exemplifies the tremendous differences between the two major parties on issues of worker's rights. I am continually reminded that during the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina, our President attempted to rescind Davis-Bacon protections at a time when local workers could least afford to have their living standards depressed. In contrast, with this bill, this Democratic Congress emphasizes its commitment to

the belief that the government has a responsibility to provide workers with a living wage as they work to improve their communities.

I applaud Representative CHANDLER and the rest of the Leadership for this bill. As I noted two weeks ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one of the hallmarks of this Congress has been its attempt to provide comprehensive solutions to complicated problems. I believe that this bill is a proud example of this trend. In a bill aimed at decreasing class sizes, the Congress has also chosen to attack climate change, promote worker's rights, and improve air quality.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill and send a clear message to the American people: This Congress is committed to smart solutions to the real problems that this country will face in the 21st Century.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Chairman, I rise today as a member of the Green Schools Caucus to strongly support the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act.

Our Nation needs new schools. The average American school is 50 years old and almost two-thirds need extensive repair. According to the GAO, 14 million students attend schools considered below standard or dangerous. But in a time of state budget deficits, fewer dollars are going to school construction projects.

Today's bill will assist local school districts with the initial costs of construction and modernization and, by investing in energy efficient technology, will result in significant long term savings. Building green costs about 2 percent more than conventional construction, but can save 20 times that amount over the life of the school.

Moreover, green school construction yields substantial environmental benefits. Green schools use on average 33 percent less energy and produce less carbon dioxide, nitrogen oxide, sulfur dioxide, and coarse particulate matter emissions.

With its investment in infrastructure, this bill provides an important economic stimulus. School districts have many projects ready to go. When this bill is passed, we will see additional jobs in the construction industry, including suppliers, architects, contractors, and engineers.

Madam Chairman, this legislation is a good, long-term investment that will improve education, reduce our energy consumption, and create jobs in local communities. I urge my colleagues to join me and support this important bill.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 3021

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR MODERNIZATION, RENOVATION, OR REPAIR OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Sec. 101. Purpose.

Sec. 102. Allocation of funds.

Sec. 103. Allowable uses of funds.

TITLE II—SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, AND ALABAMA

Sec. 201. Purpose.

Sec. 202. Allocation to States.

Sec. 203. Allowable uses of funds.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Impermissible uses of funds.

Sec. 302. Supplement, not supplant.

Sec. 303. Maintenance of effort.

Sec. 304. Special rule on contracting.

Sec. 305. Application of GEPA.

Sec. 306. Green Schools.

Sec. 307. Reporting.

Sec. 308. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) The term “Bureau-funded school” has the meaning given to such term in section 1141 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2021).

(2) The term “charter school” has the meaning given such term in section 5210 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(3) The term “local educational agency”—

(A) has the meaning given to that term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and shall also include the Recovery School District of Louisiana and the New Orleans Public Schools; and

(B) includes any public charter school that constitutes a local educational agency under State law.

(4) The term “outlying area”—

(A) means the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands; and

(B) includes the freely associated states of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau.

(5) The term “State” means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(6) The term “LEED Green Building Rating System” means the United States Green Building Council Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design green building rating standard referred to as LEED Green Building Rating System.

(7) The term “Energy Star” means the Energy Star program of the United States Department of Energy and the United States Environmental Protection Agency.

(8) The term “CHPS Criteria” means the green building rating program developed by the Collaborative for High Performance Schools.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR MODERNIZATION, RENOVATION, OR REPAIR OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

Grants under this title shall be for the purpose of modernizing, renovating, or repairing public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities that are safe, healthy, high-performing, and up-to-date technologically.

SEC. 102. ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.

(a) **RESERVATION.**—From the amount appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year pursuant to section 308(a), the Secretary shall reserve 1 percent of such amount, consistent with the purpose described in section 101—

(1) to provide assistance to the outlying areas; and

(2) for payments to the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to Bureau-funded schools.

(b) **ALLOCATION TO STATES.**—

(1) **STATE-BY-STATE ALLOCATION.**—Of the amount appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year pursuant to section 308(a), and not reserved under subsection (a), each State shall be allocated an amount in proportion to the amount received by all local educational agencies in the State under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the previous fiscal year relative to the total amount received by all local educational agencies in every State under such part for such fiscal year.

(2) **STATE ADMINISTRATION.**—A State may reserve up to 1 percent of its allocation under paragraph (1) to carry out its responsibilities under this title, including—

(A) providing technical assistance to local educational agencies;

(B) developing within 6 months of receiving its allocation under paragraph (1) a plan to develop a database that includes an inventory of public school facilities in the State and the modernization, renovation, and repair needs of, energy use by, and the carbon footprint of such schools; and

(C) developing a school energy efficiency quality plan.

(3) **GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—From the amount allocated to a State under paragraph (1), each local educational agency in the State that meets the requirements of section 1122(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall receive an amount in proportion to the amount received by such local educational agency under part A of title I of that Act for the previous fiscal year relative to the total amount received by all local educational agencies in the State under such part for such fiscal year, except that no local educational agency that received funds under part A of title I of that Act for such fiscal year shall receive a grant of less than \$5,000 in any fiscal year under this title.

(4) **SPECIAL RULE.**—Section 1122(c)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 shall not apply to paragraphs (1) or (3).

(c) **SPECIAL RULES.**—

(1) **DISTRIBUTIONS BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall make and distribute the reservations and allocations described in subsections (a) and (b) not later than 30 days after an appropriation of funds for this title is made.

(2) **DISTRIBUTIONS BY STATES.**—A State shall make and distribute the allocations described in subsection (b)(3) within 30 days of receiving such funds from the Secretary.

SEC. 103. ALLOWABLE USES OF FUNDS.

A local educational agency receiving a grant under this title may use the grant for modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, including—

(1) repairing, replacing, or installing roofs, electrical wiring, plumbing systems, sewage systems, lighting systems, or components of such systems, windows, or doors;

(2) repairing, replacing, or installing heating, ventilation, air conditioning systems, or components of such systems (including insulation), including indoor air quality assessments;

(3) bringing public schools into compliance with fire and safety codes, including modernizations, renovations, and repairs that ensure that schools are prepared for emergencies;

(4) modifications necessary to make public school facilities accessible to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.) and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), except that such modifications shall not be the primary use of the grant;

(5) asbestos abatement or removal from public school facilities;

(6) implementation of measures designed to reduce or eliminate human exposure to lead-based paint hazards through methods including interim controls, abatement, or a combination of each;

(7) upgrading or installing educational technology infrastructure to ensure that students have access to up-to-date educational technology;

(8) other modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities to—

(A) improve teachers' ability to teach and students' ability to learn;

(B) ensure the health and safety of students and staff; or

(C) make them more energy efficient; and
(9) required environmental remediation related to school modernization, renovation, or repair described in paragraphs (1) through (8).

TITLE II—SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI, AND ALABAMA

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

Grants under this title shall be for the purpose of modernizing, renovating, repairing or constructing public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities that are safe, healthy, high-performing, and up-to-date technologically in order to address such needs caused by damage resulting from Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita.

SEC. 202. ALLOCATION TO STATES.

(a) **STATE-BY-STATE ALLOCATION.**—Of the amount appropriated to carry out this title for each fiscal year pursuant to section 308(b), the Secretary shall allocate to Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama an amount equal to the number of schools in each of those States that were closed for 60 days or more during the period beginning on August 29, 2005, and ending on December 31, 2005, due to Hurricane Katrina or Hurricane Rita, relative to the number of schools in all of those States combined that were so closed.

(b) **STATE ADMINISTRATION.**—A State that receives funds under this title may reserve one-half of one percent of such funds for administrative purposes related to this title.

(c) **GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—States receiving funds under subsection (a) shall allocate such funds to local educational agencies within the State according to the criteria described in subsection (a).

(d) SPECIAL RULES.

(1) **DISTRIBUTIONS BY SECRETARY.**—The Secretary shall make and distribute the allocations described in subsection (a) not later than 30 days after an appropriation of funds for this title is made.

(2) **DISTRIBUTIONS BY STATES.**—A State shall make and distribute the allocations described in subsection (c) within 30 days of receiving such funds from the Secretary.

SEC. 203. ALLOWABLE USES OF FUNDS.

A local educational agency receiving a grant under this title may use the grant for any of the activities described in section 103, except that an agency receiving a grant under this title also may use such grant for such activities for the construction of new public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary school facilities.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. IMPERMISSIBLE USES OF FUNDS.

No funds received under this Act may be used for—

(1) payment of maintenance costs; or
(2) stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public.

SEC. 302. SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.

A local educational agency receiving a grant under this Act shall use such Federal funds only to supplement and not supplant the amount of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be available for modernization, renovation, and repair of public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities.

SEC. 303. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.

A local educational agency may receive a grant under this Act for any fiscal year only if

either the combined fiscal effort per student or the aggregate expenditures of the agency and the State involved with respect to the provision of free public education by the agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than 90 percent of the combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 304. SPECIAL RULE ON CONTRACTING.

Each local educational agency receiving a grant under this Act shall ensure that, if the agency carries out modernization, renovation, or repair through a contract, the process for any such contract ensures the maximum number of qualified bidders, including local, small, minority, and women- and veteran-owned businesses, through full and open competition.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION OF GEPA.

The grant programs under this Act are applicable programs (as that term is defined in section 400 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221)) subject to section 439 of such Act (20 U.S.C. 1232b).

SEC. 306. GREEN SCHOOLS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In a given fiscal year, a local educational agency shall use not less than the applicable percentage of funds received under this Act described in subsection (b) for public school modernization, renovation, or repairs that are—

(1) LEED Green Building Rating System-certified or consistent with any applicable provisions of the LEED Green Building Rating System;

(2) Energy Star-certified or consistent with any applicable provisions of Energy Star; or

(3) certified, designed, or verified under or meet any applicable provisions of an equivalent program to the LEED Green Building Rating System or Energy Star adopted by the State or another jurisdiction with authority over the local educational agency, such as the CHPS Criteria.

(b) **APPLICABLE PERCENTAGES.**—The applicable percentages described in subsection (a) are—

- (1) in fiscal year 2009, 50 percent;
- (2) in fiscal year 2010, 60 percent;
- (3) in fiscal year 2011, 70 percent;
- (4) in fiscal year 2012, 80 percent; and
- (5) in fiscal year 2013, 90 percent.

(c) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall provide outreach and technical assistance to States and school districts concerning the best practices in school modernization, renovation, and repair, including those related to student academic achievement and student and staff health, energy efficiency, and environmental protection.

SEC. 307. REPORTING.

(a) **REPORTS BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.**—Local educational agencies receiving a grant under this Act shall annually compile a report describing the projects for which such funds were used, including—

- (1) the number of public schools in the agency;
- (2) the number of schools in the agency with a metro-centric locale code of 41, 42, or 43 as determined by the National Center for Education Statistics and the percentage of funds received by the agency under title I or title II of this Act that were used for projects at such schools;
- (3) the number of schools in the agency that are eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the percentage of funds received by the agency under title I or title II of this Act that were used for projects at such schools; and

(4) for each project—
(A) the cost;

(B) the standard described in section 306(a) with which the use of the funds complied or if the use of funds did not comply with a standard described in section 306(a), the reason such funds were not able to be used in compliance

with such standards and the agency's efforts to use such funds in an environmentally sound manner; and

(C) any demonstrable or expected benefits as a result of the project (such as energy savings, improved indoor environmental quality, improved climate for teaching and learning, etc.).

(b) **AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.**—A local educational agency shall—

(1) submit the report described in subsection (a) to the State educational agency, which shall compile such information and report it annually to the Secretary; and

(2) make the report described in subsection (a) publicly available, including on the agency's website.

(c) **REPORTS BY SECRETARY.**—Not later than December 31 of each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on grants made under this Act, including the information described in subsection (b)(1), the types of modernization, renovation, and repair funded, and the number of students impacted, including the number of students counted under section 1113(a)(5) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

SEC. 308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **TITLE I.**—To carry out title I, there are authorized to be appropriated \$6,400,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(b) **TITLE II.**—To carry out title II, there are authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110-678. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered read; shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, as the designee of the chairman of the committee, I offer a manager's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. KILDEE:

Page 5, after line 5, insert the following:

(9) The term "public school facilities" includes charter schools.

(10) The term "Green Globes" means the Green Building Initiative environmental design and rating system referred to as Green Globes.

Page 5, line 8, insert "PUBLIC" before "SCHOOL".

Page 5, beginning on line 12, strike "kindergarten" and all that follows through "that are" and insert "school facilities, based on their need for such improvements, to be".

Page 8, line 9, strike "may" and insert "shall".

Page 8, line 11, insert "including extensive, intensive or semi-intensive green roofs," after "roofs".

Page 8, line 14, before the semicolon insert “, including security doors.”

Page 8, strike lines 19 through 22, and insert the following:

(3) bringing public schools into compliance with fire, health, and safety codes, including professional installation of fire/life safety alarms, including modernizations, renovations, and repairs that ensure that schools are prepared for emergencies, such as improving building infrastructure to accommodate security measures;

Page 9, line 4, insert “or polychlorinated biphenyls” after “asbestos”.

Page 9, after line 9, insert the following:

(7) implementation of measures designed to reduce or eliminate human exposure to mold or mildew.

Page 9, line 10, strike “(7)” and insert “(8)”.

Page 9, after line 12, insert the following:

(9) modernization, renovation, or repair of science and engineering laboratory facilities, libraries, and career and technical education facilities, including those related to energy efficiency and renewable energy, and improvements to building infrastructure to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian access;

Page 9, line 13, strike “(8)” and insert “(10)”.

Page 9, line 20, strike “(9)” and insert “(11)”.

Page 9, line 21, insert “public” before “school”.

Page 9, line 22, strike “(8).” and insert “(10).”.

Page 10, beginning on line 6, strike “kindergarten” and all that follows through “that are” and insert “school facilities, based on their need for such improvements, to be”.

Page 10, beginning on line 9, strike “in order” and all that follows through “Rita” on line 10.

Page 11, line 16, strike “may use the grant for any” and insert “shall use the grant for one or more”.

Page 11, line 19, strike “kindergarten, elementary, and secondary”.

Page 12, beginning on line 9, strike “and repair” and all that follows through “educational” and insert “repair, and construction of public school”.

Page 12, after line 10, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 302A. PROHIBITION REGARDING STATE AID.

A State shall not take into consideration payments under this Act in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of State aid, with respect to free public education of children.

Page 12, line 12, insert “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “A local”.

Page 12, after line 19, insert the following: (b) REDUCTION IN CASE OF FAILURE TO MEET.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State educational agency shall reduce the amount of a local educational agency’s grant in any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which a local educational agency fails to meet the requirement of subsection (a) of this section by falling below 90 percent of both the combined fiscal effort per student and aggregate expenditures (using the measure most favorable to the local agency).

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—No such lesser amount shall be used for computing the effort required under subsection (a) of this section for subsequent years.

(c) WAIVER.—The Secretary shall waive the requirements of this section if the Secretary determines that a waiver would be equitable due to—

(1) exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances, such as a natural disaster; or

(2) a precipitous decline in the financial resources of the local educational agency.

Page 12, line 23, strike “or repair” and insert “repair, or construction”.

Page 13, beginning on line 12, strike “or repairs” and insert “repairs, or construction”.

Page 13, line 13, insert “certified, verified, or consistent with any applicable provisions of” after “are”.

Page 13, strike lines 14 through 24 and insert the following:

(1) the LEED Green Building Rating System;

(2) Energy Star;

(3) the CHPS Criteria;

(4) Green Globes; or

(5) an equivalent program adopted by the State or another jurisdiction with authority over the local educational agency.

Page 14, line 13, strike “and repair,” and insert “repair, and construction.”

Page 14, line 21, before the semicolon insert “, including the number of charter schools”

Page 14, after line 21, insert the following:

(2) the total amount of funds received by the local educational agency under this Act and the amount of such funds expended, including the amount expended for modernization, renovation, repair, or construction of charter schools;

Page 14, line 22, strike “(2)” and insert “(3)”.

Page 14, line 22, insert “public” before “schools”.

Page 15, line 3, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)”.

Page 15, line 3, insert “public” before “schools”.

Page 15, line 9, strike “(4)” and insert “(5)”.

Page 15, line 8, strike “and”.

Page 15, line 22, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

Page 15, after line 22, insert the following:

(6) the total number and amount of contracts awarded, and the number and amount of contracts awarded to local, small, minority, women, and veteran-owned businesses.

Page 16, beginning on line 13, strike “and repair” and insert “repair, and construction”.

Page 16, after line 25, insert the following (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 309. SPECIAL RULES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds authorized by this Act may be—

(1) used to employ workers in violation of section 274A of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a); or

(2) distributed to a local educational agency that does not have a policy that requires a criminal background check on all employees of the agency.

Page 17, strike the title amendment and insert the following:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, and for other purposes.”

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank Chairwoman SLAUGHTER and the Rules Committee for their work and for making this amendment in order.

Madam Chairman, this bill would address three critical issues facing our country: closing the achievement gap, boosting the economy by creating

thousands of construction jobs, and reducing school energy costs and protecting the environment. This bill provides long overdue investment in public school facilities around the country. And this amendment would improve the bill by ensuring that schools could use these funds for modernizations, renovations, and repairs including green roofs; abatement of polychlorinated biphenyls and mold and mildew; and various security measures.

Highlighting the need for improvements to science and engineering laboratories, libraries, career and technical education facilities, especially those related to energy efficiency and renewable energy, and to facilitate access to schools by different modes of transportation; strengthening language ensuring charter schools’ eligibility for these funds, which was asked for from the other side; expanding local flexibility by adding “Green Globes” to the list of green rating systems; adding reporting requirements to ensure local accountability; and clarifying that no funds may be used to employ undocumented workers and requiring that school districts receiving these funds have a policy requiring a criminal background check on their employees.

I want to thank the many Members whose input is reflected in this amendment: Representatives ARCURI, BAIRD, CROWLEY, HASTINGS of Florida, HOOLEY, KLEIN of Florida, LEE, MATHESON, MCCARTHY, MITCHELL, PATRICK MURPHY, RICHARDSON, SUTTON, WELCH, and WU.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I oppose this amendment, Madam Chairman, for the same reason I oppose the underlying bill.

This proposal radically shifts the Federal role in education. This new school construction program will compete for funding with other critical priorities like title I and IDEA. And no matter what the other side tries to tell you, every dollar spent under this legislation is a dollar that won’t be spent improving academic achievement for disadvantaged children.

Here in Congress our job is to set priorities. Are we really saying that it’s more important to fund bicycle racks, as this substitute would do, than it is to provide funds for schools to serve children with disabilities? I don’t deny that schools can use bicycle racks, but I challenge anyone to explain why that’s a priority for scarce Federal dollars when title I and IDEA continue to be funded below their authorized level.

I also think this entire debate is a distraction from the most immediate financial concern facing many school systems and every family in this Nation: That's the high price of gasoline. School districts are struggling just to fill the tanks on their school buses. They're scaling back field trips and activities. And some schools are even moving to a 4-day school week to save on energy costs. Just like the rest of the country, our schools need energy relief and they need it now.

But we're not here today to discuss how we can produce more American-made energy. We're not here to promote new clean and reliable sources of energy like advanced nuclear and next-generation coal. We're not even here to encourage greater energy efficiency by offering conservation tax incentives to Americans who make their home, car, and businesses more energy efficient. Instead, we are proposing a big government program to exert Federal control over how States and local communities build their schools. It's the classic Washington approach to problem solving: If we just kick in a little bit of money, we'll be able to wield our power and influence over the decisions that used to be made by individual citizens and local leaders. Surely Washington must know best when it comes to where our children learn.

Madam Chairman, I oppose this amendment, I oppose this legislation, and I oppose the fact that Congress has yet to do anything to address the skyrocketing cost of energy.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3021, the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Facilities Act.

I was proud to work with the chairman and Mr. BLUMENAUER to authorize the use of funds to improve building infrastructure to facilitate bike and pedestrian access. This could include bike storage facilities, safety lighting, lockers, safe travel routes on school grounds for bicyclists and pedestrians, and more.

Alternative modes of transportation and storage facilities for bicycles are recognized by the U.S. Green Building Council as criteria for obtaining certification as a green school and are critical to reducing emissions and the carbon footprint of our Nation's schools.

With skyrocketing gas prices, American families are feeling the pain at the pump. It's my hope that this amendment will help ease that burden by encouraging students, just as we did, to walk and bike to school rather than catch a ride with their parents or drive themselves. I would like to thank my friend Representative BLUMENAUER for working with me on this important provision and commend him for his tireless work on this issue.

Additionally, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, along with his staff, for their work to bring this legislation to the floor today.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. RICHARDSON).

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Chairman, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for putting this important legislation together, and I applaud his resourcefulness for including my provision within this amendment that solidifies the eligibility for grants to be used in the construction of green roofs at public schools.

Throughout the past decade, green roofs have proven to be a cost-effective and an environmentally conscious way of lowering utility costs by insulating buildings from extreme temperatures and reducing the sewer system and wastewater treatment costs. In addition, green roofs diminish air pollution by using plants to collect airborne particles and produce oxygen through photosynthesis. Green roofs also decrease costs associated with roofing maintenance by lengthening the lifespan and durability of the roofs. And, also, more importantly, it gives young people an opportunity to see real learning experiences work.

I ask my colleagues to seriously evaluate this legislation and pass this amendment and pass H.R. 3021.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have been kind of talking about supply and demand in energy. Today we are also talking supply and demand of money. There's unlimited demand for resources, but there is somewhat limited supply. And what we're talking about in this bill is that the demand is for the Federal Government to get involved in local school construction.

I served on a local school board, and I met with a lot of other people that served on local school boards, and I know what they're going to want to do. They are going to want to turn to the Federal Government and take all the money that's available, and then they will use that to build the schools, and then they'll find other ways to spend the money that they've been spending on schools for other things. That's how supply and demand works. You kind of take what's available and fill up the gap.

I was home last week, as most of us were, for the break, and I hadn't been home for a couple of weeks. I was shocked at what the gas prices were, and they went up about 20 cents during the week while I was home. And it's all based on supply and demand.

We have had several votes over the last 16 years that I have been here in Congress. We voted to explore for more oil in the ANWR. House Republicans, 91 percent supported increasing supply;

House Democrats, 86 percent opposed increasing supply.

Coal to liquid is another thing that should increase the supply, which would then meet the demand and help lower gasoline prices. House Republicans voted 97 percent to support coal to liquid; House Democrats, 78 percent opposed that.

Oil shale exploration, which again would increase supply and meet the demand and lower prices. House Republicans, 90 percent supported it; House Democrats, 86 percent opposed.

This goes on and on and on. What we are saying on our side is we will support exploration, conservation, renewable, all sources of increasing supply to get energy independent. The other side says we can't do this, we can't do this, we can't do this; let's keep buying oil from Iraq and Iran and Saudi Arabia and Venezuela and not become independent.

□ 1815

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. KILDEE. The gentleman from California suggested that this bill would impose Federal control over local decisions. But, again, representatives of local parents, teachers, principals and superintendents are in strong support of this bill. The Counsel of Great City Schools says it gets these funds to schools with a minimum of red tape. Now they are the ones that are really on the front line. We have our level of expertise here in this Congress on education, but the groups I have mentioned are really on the front lines every day and they see the need out there, and they feel that this bill would distribute these funds for this purpose with a minimum of red tape. I believe that to be the case.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. EHLERS. I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. EHLERS:

Page 11, line 25, strike "or".

Page 12, line 3, strike the period at the end and insert "; or".

Page 12, after line 3, insert the following new paragraph:

(3) purchasing carbon offsets.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. EHLERS. One part about this bill that is probably worthwhile is the effort to reduce energy use, and in particular to reduce the carbon footprint, as it has come to be called, although I have always joked that I prefer "carbon tire tracks" because we produce a lot more carbon dioxide with our cars than from other common sources. Nevertheless, this bill allows schools to use funds to reduce the carbon footprint of their schools.

As I perused this bill, I realized that it was entirely possible that the schools might decide to use the Federal funds to purchase carbon offsets or carbon credits. To me, that would make absolutely no sense whatsoever. Because schools are small, they do not emit huge amounts of carbon dioxide, and the money that they might want to use for that can much better be used to improve insulation in the schools, improve the insulation in the walls, improve the type of windows so that there's less energy escaping. There are many modifications that can be made that would reduce energy use, and by reducing energy use, you reduce the carbon footprint.

I would also maintain that it is much more effective to reduce the energy use, whether it's by better insulation or by sealing the windows, or putting in the appropriate type of glass. It's much more cost-effective in reducing the carbon footprint than it would be to buy carbon offsets. So it seems to me that we should make certain that no school would ever attempt to use Federal funds, if this bill passes, for the purpose of buying carbon credits.

This is not because I oppose carbon credits. I think this is something that in fact we will be facing shortly because the Senate is working on a bill on that issue, but I am simply for efficiency, not wasting money, making certain that the money that is in this bill, if this bill passes, will be used wisely and will be used to conserve energy, not to purchase carbon offsets.

With that in mind, I offer this bill to make certain that money is not improperly used and to make sure that we use the funds efficiently.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. We have looked at the amendment and we feel we can accept it on this side. I would urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. I just wish to state that I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan, the other gentleman from Michigan accepting this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. As the designee of Ms. SHEA-PORTER of New Hampshire, I call up an amendment made in order by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

Page 9, after line 12, insert the following:

(8) renewable energy generation and heating systems, including solar, photovoltaic, wind, geothermal, or biomass, including wood pellet, systems or components of such systems;

Page 9, line 13, strike "(8)" and insert "(9)".

Page 9, line 20, strike "(9)" and insert "(10)".

Page 9, line 22, strike "(8)." and insert "(9).".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. At this time I recognize the principal author of this amendment, Congresswoman CAROL SHEA-PORTER of New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I am proud to offer this amendment alongside my colleagues, Representatives WELCH, ARCURI, and HODES, and I thank them for their hard work on this amendment. I would also like to thank Chairman MILLER, Subcommittee Chairman KILDEE, and Representatives CHANDLER and LOEBSACK for their hard work on this legislation.

Madam Chairman, energy and heating costs are on the rise and communities across the country are feeling the pinch. Now more than ever, it's important to focus on sustainable forms of energy and heating production. Going green is not only the right thing to do for our environment and for national security reasons, but it's the financially responsible thing to do as well.

The Shea-Porter/Welch/Arcuri/Hodes amendment builds on the positive steps taken in H.R. 3021 by specifying that the funds authorized by this act may be used to invest in sustainable solutions that meet the energy and heating needs of our Nation's school facilities. Sustainable solutions such as geothermal, solar, wind, and biomass technologies will help to mitigate the costs

of the increasing traditional energy sources on our schools by reducing the schools' dependence on traditional sources. This amendment makes a simple change, but it is an important one, as it serves to provide school districts with greater flexibility in the use of these dollars.

Madam Chairman, 82 percent of the 475 public schools in my home State of New Hampshire were built prior to 1981, and 36 were built prior to 1951. Just think of all the advances that have been made in heating and energy efficiency technologies since then. The underlying legislation will certainly help modernize these schools, and with our amendment, H.R. 3021, will do even more by allowing school districts to make critical investments in sustainable heating and energy solutions.

Madam Chairman, the Shea-Porter/Welch/Arcuri/Hodes amendment is supported by the National Education Association, and it deserves the support of our colleagues as well. I urge a "yea" vote on this amendment and the underlying legislation. Let's invest in our school infrastructure in an environmentally and economically sound way.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment, although I don't expect to oppose its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment allows funding under the massive new program to be used for renewable energy generation and heating systems in schools. Clearly, this amendment recognizes that schools are grappling with the high cost of energy, and they need help. I couldn't agree more. But we are acknowledging that schools, like the rest of the country, are being burdened by the skyrocketing costs of gasoline, diesel fuel, and other energy sources. I'd like to know why we are not having a real debate about energy solutions.

Giving schools a little bit of money for renewable energy generation and heating systems, while ignoring the problem of rising gasoline, diesel, and other energy costs, will not solve the problems our schools are facing. In the Northeast, for instance, we know that many schools rely on home heating oil during the winter months. Clearly, a one-size-fits-all approach isn't going to work.

What we need are comprehensive energy solutions. We need to expand production here at home, something my friends on the other side of the aisle have historically opposed 86 percent of the time. We need to encourage innovation and invest in new fuel alternatives, and we need to promote conservation. Only by embracing meaningful energy reforms will we finally be

able to move toward energy independence and provide our schools, especially those impacted by the skyrocketing costs of heating oil, much needed relief. That is why I am so disappointed in this legislation. It's quite simply the wrong solution to the wrong problem.

If the question is how should the Federal Government help our schools, the answer is by funding programs that promote academic achievement for disadvantaged children. If the question is how should the Federal Government help schools burdened by high energy costs, the answer is by taking decisive action to increase energy production here at home, and red tape and regulations encourage next generation energy sources and promote conservation.

The bill achieves none of these goals. I won't oppose passage of this amendment, but I strongly oppose passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my colleague from Vermont for yielding. I would like to also thank the chairman, Chairman MILLER, and Subcommittee Chairman KILDEE for this wonderful piece of legislation.

Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment, which would allow schools to purchase and install renewable energy generation systems. Our amendment would allow schools to choose from a diverse selection of renewable energy sources. But I would like to specifically highlight two that pose significant potential: Geothermal and biomass wood pellet systems.

Just last week during the Memorial Day District Work Period, I had an opportunity to tour the Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES in Auburn, New York, and received a firsthand look at a geothermal heating and cooling system in action. The Cayuga-Onondaga BOCES completed installation last July of a closed-loop geothermal system. The system includes 200 wells around the campus, 330 feet deep, that tap into the earth's constant ground temperature at a level of 55 degrees. The system circulates that 55-degree air temperature year round throughout the buildings on the campus.

□ 1830

In the winter, the system relies on a boiler to slightly increase the air temperature on the campus to a comfortable level of 68 degrees, requiring substantially less energy than normal, and in the warm summer months, the system needs no additional energy whatsoever to cool the buildings on campus.

The New York State Energy Research Development Authority recently conducted a study that found the system to be a remarkable 43 percent more energy efficient than a building built to standard code. While

it might be too soon to qualify the actual monthly cost savings, I think it is safe to say that a building 43 percent more energy efficient will realize significant cost savings in the future and allow a school district to spend resources where they are most needed, on better educating our students, hiring more teachers, and to fund underfunded programs like the IDEA.

The second component of this amendment I wish to highlight is wood pellet energy. Wood has the potential to meet our Nation's energy needs in a safe and environmentally responsible way. Studies show that commodities can save significant taxpayer funds by switching to wood energy for heating schools. For example, communities can save as much as 50 percent over natural gas, 80 percent over propane, 80 percent over electric heat and 50 percent over oil by switching to wood energy.

Especially in the upstate New York district that I represent, with its bountiful forest resources, wood energy such as biomass offers an array of economic environmental benefits compared to traditional fossil fuels. Both geothermal and wood energy systems can be fueled by renewable local resources. This keeps energy dollars circulating in the local and regional economy, instead of flowing to other nations. These systems also aid local budgets by providing lower and more stable fuel costs for our schools. Investments like this benefit the whole community by relieving pressure on local budgets and associated tax rates, leading to healthier communities. Unlike some other renewable energy systems, both geothermal and biomass systems can run continuously and provide a constant level of power throughout the day.

Beyond the amendment my colleagues and I are offering today, it is also worth noting the overall benefits of the underlying legislation. Everyone in this Chamber, Republican and Democrat, understands the importance of lowering energy prices.

The 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act represents a trifecta of sound public policy. It improves the education system for our children, it does so in an environmentally friendly way that decreases our dependence on finite fossil fuels, and it creates jobs for hard-working middle class families. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying legislation.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to first thank my colleagues, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH and Mr. ARCURI, for their work on this important amendment. This amendment will help schools in my district in New Hampshire to power their classrooms with alternative energy sources, including wood pellets and wood biomass,

sources that are plentiful throughout New Hampshire. For example, under this new program, the program would help invest more than half a million dollars for Concord, New Hampshire's school district, and almost \$1.5 million for Nashua, New Hampshire's schools. These dollars will allow our schools to reinvest in cost-effective and clean alternative energy.

Schools throughout New Hampshire are already investing to a limited extent in renewable energy and saving money. For example, Merrimack Valley High School and Middle School recently switched to wood biomass to heat their school facilities. In just one winter, the school district saved \$80,000 in heating costs, and that was before the recent steep rise in the price of a barrel of oil. From March to March, that is \$1.50 a gallon for heating oil that the costs have gone up, so we can only imagine what they will save in the coming winter.

As you can see, the alternative energies we promote here will help save money for our Nation's school districts in power and heating costs. That means schools will have more dollars to invest in improving our children's education. It means our school districts can afford more teachers in the classroom, more computers for our students and smaller class sizes to give our kids more individual attention. It means that our wise investments in this bill will pay huge dividends.

Energy efficiency, conservation and renewable energy are the key to a secure energy future for the United States of America. We can't drill our way out of the energy crisis we face. Green is the new red, white and blue.

To create a 21st century energy policy, we must all collectively make changes in how we power our buildings in both the private and public sector. This amendment will help our schools become leaders in an energy plan for the 21st century and give our school districts more resources to invest in our children's education. I am proud to support this amendment. I urge its passage.

Mr. McKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

As the gentleman that just spoke said, we cannot drill our way into energy independence. I agree, because over the past 12 years, every time we have had a vote to give us an opportunity to explore and find more oil to get us past the gap to where all these other things that they are talking about will work, 91 percent of House Republicans have historically supported the increase of production of American-made oil and gas, while 86 percent of House Democrats have historically voted against increasing the production of American-made oil and gas.

Ten years ago when we passed an energy bill that would let us drill in the ANWR which would reduce gas prices now 70 cents to \$1.60 a gallon, and that would be in production now and we

would be receiving that benefit, President Clinton vetoed that bill.

So, yes, we can't drill our way out of it. We have to sit here and buy oil from countries around the globe that want to see us destroyed, and I don't see how we possibly can continue to go on putting ourselves in that position. We need to find new energy, and we need to do it now.

Madam Chairman, as I said, I will not oppose this amendment. I oppose the underlying bill for many, many reasons.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just briefly close.

Madam Chairman, there are two issues that have been debated during the course of this proposed amendment. One is what is the proper way to try to provide new supplies of oil.

There is a debate here, as Mr. McKEON has outlined it, and it has been carried on in many other bills relating to energy, about the possibility of the United States drilling and capturing more oil and natural gas here in our own territorial boundaries. The premise, of course, is if we did that, we would be able significantly to address the problem, and it also has as a premise that the obstacles to drilling are what is causing us not to drill.

In fact, that simply is not true. There are tens of millions of acres of federally owned land that are leased to the oil and gas companies, and only 28 percent of acres on shore and only 20 percent of the acres offshore where there actually are leases left are producing oil and gas. So there is an enormous capacity already that is out there for oil and gas companies to do the drilling. Why they don't, I guess we would have to ask them. But it is hard to imagine that there is a disincentive for them to take these leases that they have, giving them the opportunity to drill, when we have got oil that hovers around \$130 a barrel. So the suggestion that that is the problem I think is incorrect.

Secondly, the United States, and we have got to face this, we have 2 percent of the world's oil supply. That is it. Yet we consume 24 percent of the oil. So if we think that it is going to be a long-term approach to dealing with the increasing cost of oil when we are using 24 percent and we only have 2 percent of the known reserves, I think that is going to fall on its own weight.

The second issue really is putting aside that debate about what is the long-term, shall we be drilling or not, it begs the question of whether shouldn't we be doing everything that is within our capacity right now to give tools to local communities to save money on their energy costs and don't make the policy argument about whether we should or shouldn't be drilling be an impediment to taking the concrete step that this bill proposes to give our schools the tools they need to save money.

Let me just give you a couple of examples in Vermont. We have 32 schools that have transitioned to wood biomass. These are small schools, but they have saved over 1 million gallons of home heating oil. Home heating oil now in Vermont, the last bill I paid was \$4.30 a gallon. That is over \$4 million. That also, as my colleague Mr. ARCURI said, is a trifecta, because it reduced carbon emissions by 11,000 tons. It also provided jobs to local Vermonters who are providing the basic material that provided the energy to these schools.

So this is an extraordinary incentive for our local schools to try to save money. That is a burden that is immense on the property taxpayers, and this is a practical piece of legislation that allows our communities and our schools to take positive steps to reduce the bottom line.

I urge, along with my colleagues who have offered this amendment, led by Congresswoman CAROL SHEA-PORTER, a "yes" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. DAVIS of Virginia:

Page 8, after line 6, insert the following:

(3) DISTRIBUTIONS BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—A local educational agency receiving a grant under this title may give priority, in using the grant, to projects to be carried out in a public secondary school recognized as a Science and Technology High School or as a secondary school with a science and technology program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 3021 that would allow local education priority consideration for science and technology schools once grant funds reach their State's local educational agencies.

I have traditionally opposed the concept of the Federal Government directly funding school construction and renovation. However, I believe the legislation today provides an excellent opportunity to advance what should be an increasingly prominent component of Federal education policy, active promotion and assistance for rigorous science, math and technology programs at the secondary level.

Science, math and technology schools throughout the country enable students to cultivate a spirit of discovery and innovation. More importantly, they give some of our best and our very brightest the ability to compete with similarly talented students from other countries around the world.

In my district, Thomas Jefferson High School for Science and Technology is a perfect example of the type of institution we should be promoting nationwide. TJ, as we call it, is part of the Fairfax County public school system, but draws applicants from across five counties and two cities in Northern Virginia, selecting 500 students from a pool of several thousand applicants. While TJ tops the list of U.S. News and World Report's list of America's best high schools, its building and infrastructure is deteriorating and in need of repair. It also needs access to increasingly advanced laboratory facilities to provide cutting edge programs and study.

I appreciate the concerns of my colleagues regarding an expanded Federal role in school construction. I want to note, however, that there can be a role for Congress to play.

□ 1845

One of our congressional accomplishments was closing the Lorton Prison and putting some of that land into the public school system in Fairfax County in which South County High School was built, a public-private partnership.

As we debate added Federal participation in school construction maintenance, I am ready to set aside pre-existing qualms to make sure that schools focused on science, math, and technology receive the focus they merit. Make no mistake, these individuals and skills that these students possess will be the foundation of our economy in the coming years. It is in our interest to give them the foundation they will need to excel in a world that is quickly catching up with us.

In closing, I want to thank Chairman MILLER and his staff for their willingness to work with me on this issue. I look forward to continuing this effort as this legislation moves forward, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for his work on this bill and for all his work here in the Congress. He has been a distinguished Member of this Congress, one who loves this institution. And as he goes off in other pursuits, I certainly wish him well.

I look around this Congress, and you see on both sides of the aisle people for whom you have great respect, and he certainly has my respect. His interest in science and technology makes him the natural one to have the expertise in this and apply that to our K-12 schools.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I just want to thank the gentleman for making this amendment in order. I appreciate his support as the legislation moves forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I rise as the designee for Mr. STUPAK to claim time in support of the amendment offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. VISCLOSKY:

Page 6, line 3, strike "308(a)" and insert "309(a)".

Page 10, line 14, strike "308(b)" and insert "309(b)".

Page 13, after line 2, insert the following (and redesignate provisions and conform the table of contents accordingly):

SEC. 305. SPECIAL RULE ON USE OF IRON AND STEEL PRODUCED IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A local educational agency shall not obligate or expend funds received under this Act for a project for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facility unless all of the iron and steel used in such project is produced in the United States.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply in any case in which the local educational agency finds that—

(1) their application would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) iron and steel are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality;

(3) inclusion of iron and steel produced in the United States will increase the cost of the overall project contract by more than 25 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, I first of all would like to express my

appreciation to Mr. STUPAK for all of his hard work on this initiative, but also would like to thank the chairman of the full committee as well as the ranking member for their work on this important bill, as well as the chairwoman of the Rules Committee for making this amendment in order.

The amendment would require all iron and steel purchased with funds authorized by this act to use only American-made steel. This stems from a Steel Caucus hearing that was held in April, where we learned that the government does not have an established process to monitor the safety of steel imports. We also learned that foreign imports from China, for example, do not adhere to international standards and guidelines when they manufacture steel.

If the school construction projects provided under this act are to be truly safe for our children, then we must ensure that the steel used is American. If we buy only American steel for our schools, we will know that it adheres to our safety and quality standards, and would encourage my colleagues to support the Stupak-Visclosky amendment to keep our schools safe and to vote for passage of the underlying measure.

Madam Chairman, I recognize the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WILSON) for 1½ minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Ohio. Madam Chairman, I rise today in support of the Stupak-Visclosky amendment, calling for all iron and steel used under this act to be produced here in our United States.

Since 1892, my home State of Ohio has been a leading steel producer, and today remains among the top three steel producing States in our country.

In April, I had the opportunity to attend a hearing held by the Congressional Steel Caucus examining the dangers of standardized substandard Chinese steel. What I learned was that these products are not being inspected in China and the products are not being inspected at our ports when they enter our country. And again, today, the steel is not inspected as it is used to build some of our Nation's most critical infrastructure, like our children's schools.

In the last year we have seen China's iron and steel production increase by more than 50 percent. Today, Chinese steel is being used to make everything from our schools to our hospitals to our bridges, and I have serious concerns about whether or not this Chinese steel is strong enough to keep our families and our Nation safe.

This amendment will ensure that the steel used is from American companies that will follow the proper safety and quality standards in our products. Our children deserve safe schools. A strong and viable U.S. steel industry is critical to America's infrastructure and the national economic security and homeland security.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to join me and to support the Stupak-

Visclosky amendment, and encourage my fellow Members to vote for final passage of this important bill.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I rise the claim the time on this side in favor of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this amendment, which would require local education agencies to use American steel and iron for modernization, renovation, or repair projects, such as at a public school facility. As the past chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus and as the current vice chairman of that body, I have been working for some time on a bipartisan basis to promote policies to provide for the use of American steel precisely in these sorts of settings.

Madam Chairman, you may recall one of my favorite books which was Robert Penn Warren's remarkable novel, *All the King's Men*, in which the anti-hero Willie Stark is thrust into prominence because he takes on the local political machine, the local political machine which is building a schoolhouse with cheap materials at risk to students. He raises this issue; he is ignored, but in the end he is vindicated because once the schoolhouse is built, because of cheap steel ultimately many children are hurt and killed in a terrible accident.

Today, we are contemplating a similar set of circumstances and the same risk. Just a few months ago, our Steel Caucus held a hearing to examine the dangers with imported Chinese steel products. What we discovered is that there are serious and legitimate concerns regarding the quality of these imports and whether they are adequately monitored. We currently have no mechanism for evaluating or for stopping steel that does not meet specifications at the border. And once it is inside our market, this steel is used on bridges, buildings, power plants, and even schools. In fact, in the fall of 2007, the California Department of General Services posted an alert on Chinese steel tubing fabricated for school construction projects that had been found to be defective.

Through independent tests and studies we know that there are frequently deficiencies in Chinese steel, yet we also know that American steel consistently has met the highest standards.

Madam Chairman, if the goal of the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Facilities Act is to provide a safe and healthy learning environment for children, we should be insisting that we are using steel of a clearly determined quality; and, we would be doing a disservice to the parents and to the children of our country by not ensuring that the school's infrastructure is built with steel of a guaranteed quality. The difference between

steel that makes the grade and steel that doesn't meet required standards could very well be a matter of life and death.

The use of deficient or structurally inefficient steel for renovations or repair projects is a clear public safety hazard. Such a blunder could increase the overall cost of projects and increase construction time. If the school construction projects provided under this legislation are truly going to meet the high standards that we expect of any structure for our children, we must ensure that the steel used is from American companies that will follow the proper safety and quality standards in its products.

Madam Chairman, this is a common-sense amendment that mirrors legislation that I have introduced with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) earlier this year. I am delighted that the author has seen fit to offer it as part of this legislation. I would strongly urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairman, it is my privilege to recognize Mr. STUPAK, the principal author of the amendment, for 1½ minutes. He is the leader on this issue.

Mr. STUPAK. I thank the gentleman. I thank him for his assistance and for pinch hitting for me tonight until I could get here.

Madam Chairman, the Stupak-Visclosky amendment would require that all steel and iron used under the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public Schools Facilities Act be produced in the United States. Cheap imported steel is a danger to our children and is compromising their safety.

In April, during the Congressional Steel Caucus hearing, U.S. Customs and Border Protection Assistant Commissioner David Baldwin testified that Customs and Border Protection does not conduct compliance tests to monitor the strength, durability, or hardness of the steel imported into the United States.

Until the Federal Government can make sure imported steel from China and other countries meet safety and quality standards, we should not let any of it be used in our schools, or in any other buildings, as a matter of fact.

We must make sure that the steel used in these projects meets the proper standards in the first place. The Stupak-Visclosky amendment would require educational agencies to use American steel and iron for modernization, renovation, or repair projects at a public school facility.

The amendment also includes a provision that will ensure that schools can comply with these standards. If steel and iron produced in the U.S. will increase the cost of a project by more than 25 percent, and iron and steel from elsewhere is proven safe, then agencies can use steel and iron from other sources as long as it is safe.

To protect our children, we must ensure that the steel used in our schools is from American companies that meet proper safety and quality standards. I urge a "yes" vote on the Stupak-Visclosky amendment.

□ 1900

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, at this time, if the gentleman has no other speakers, we would be delighted to yield back.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I believe, Madam Chairman, I have 1 minute left. I would yield that to Mr. KUCINICH, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. The Visclosky/Stupak amendment will boost our steel industry and protect American jobs by requiring that steel and iron used in school buildings funded by this act be made in the USA.

Concerns about substandard steel imports are well taken. At a recent hearing sponsored by the Congressional Steel Caucus, it was revealed that independent testing of imported Chinese steel found a 60 percent failure rate for steel rods used for such applications as securing bridges.

This amendment will ensure that the substandard steel will not be used to construct vital infrastructure or schools for those of us who are truly concerned about the safety of our children. China's going to have to go a way to be able to develop quality testing standards to assure that the products that are sent here are going to be up to the standards that we expect should be obtained for infrastructure and for schools.

This initiative maintains our commitment to securing a strong domestic steel industry, and I ask for the Members to support it.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Stupak/Visclosky amendment.

Madam Chairman, in order to build state of the art schools, you need sound state of the art materials. This amendment ensures that our schools will be constructed with strong and durable resources by mandating that our schools be built with American steel.

I would like to thank Congressman STUPAK and Congressman VISCLOSKY for offering this worthwhile amendment. There is nothing more important than ensuring that our children have safe and productive environments in which to learn.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Stupak/Visclosky amendment and the underlining bill.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that amendment No. 6 will not be offered at this time.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. MATHESON:

Page 15, line 18, strike "and".

Page 15, after line 18, insert the following (and redesignate provisions accordingly):

(C) if flooring was installed, whether—

(i) it was low- or no-VOC (Volatile Organic Compounds) flooring;

(ii) it was made from sustainable materials; and

(iii) use of flooring described in clause (i) or (ii) was cost-effective; and

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Chairman, this amendment is an effort to refine the reporting of requirements in the legislation for schools that receive grants under this program relative to the flooring that is installed in these schools.

Schools and local educational agencies receiving grants under this bill would report if they install flooring, whether it was low or no volatile organic compounds flooring; whether it was made from sustainable materials, and report on the cost effective nature of that decision to install that type of flooring.

I just want to be clear though. This amendment is not a mandate. It doesn't require schools to install any particular type of flooring. It really is a purpose just to gather information to find out if or not this material has been used in the installation process.

One of the motivations behind this amendment is to ensure that we raise this issue about the opportunity for both children and teachers who are in schools, that they are put in the best learning and teaching environment possible. The reason for that is because materials such as flooring in some schools can contain potentially unhealthy levels of volatile organic compounds that can lead to unsafe indoor air quality for both students and teachers.

Again, I think this is a relatively straightforward amendment just to increase the reporting requirements to say what happened in terms of how the flooring was required. It does not require any particular type of flooring to be installed, but it helps us gather information and raise awareness about the benefits of using low or no volatile organic compound flooring.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCKEON. I yield myself such time as I may consume, Madam Chairman.

The purpose of this amendment is to gather information about the types of

floors that schools may be installing with funds provided under this massive new federally funded school construction program. Like the rest of the bill, it simply misses the point.

If our goal today is to address the problems facing our Nation's schools, we shouldn't be talking about floors or bicycle racks. We should be talking about how to bring down the price of gas.

High gas prices are hitting schools hard. They're driving up costs for nearly every aspect of a school's budget, from transportation to school lunches and from utilities to supplies.

What we should be debating is how to address the skyrocketing cost of energy. Instead, we're talking about creating a \$20 billion program that allows bureaucrats in Washington to tell our communities how to build their schools.

The Federal Government has had a history of investing in our Nation's schools, but it's not the floors and the walls and the plumbing and the light bulbs where we focus our investment. Rather, it's the students themselves. Our role, the role of the Federal Government, is to support programs that help improve student academic achievement.

We know that disadvantaged children, children with disabilities, English language learners and our vulnerable populations have too often been left behind by our educational system. Our job is to ensure all children are given the opportunity to receive a high quality education. That means learning from a highly qualified teacher and being held to the same high academic standards.

I know how important safe and healthy schools are, and that's why States are spending some \$20 billion each year on the building and modernization of schools facilities.

If we really want to meet the needs of our schools, we should be doing two things: We should be maintaining the Federal focus on student achievement, and we should be talking about how to bring down the cost of energy to help schools, families, businesses and our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATHESON. Just very briefly, Madam Chairman.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit Daybreak Elementary School in West Jordan, Utah, the first LEED-certified school in our State. In that location this school used low VOC paint and carpet.

I think that there are a number of issues we need to be talking about in this Congress today. But I do think the notion of having a safe indoor environment for teachers and students has merit, and actually collecting data and reporting what type of materials are used in school construction makes sense.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McKEON. I agree with the gentleman. I just don't think it should be

the Federal Government's responsibility to go into the local communities and tell them what type and how to build their schools, who should build their schools and how much they should spend.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MATHESON. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 110-678.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. REICHERT: Page 9, line 18, strike "or".

Page 9, line 19, strike "and" and insert "or".

Page 9, after line 19, insert the following new subparagraph:

(D) reduce class size; and

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1234, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Chairman, today we are considering legislation to improve the conditions of our elementary and secondary schools. Yet nothing in this bill addresses the issue of class size and the overcrowding that plagues our schools and hinders the learning environment of our children.

There are 50 million students in our public elementary and secondary schools, and enrollment is expected to continue to increase. By the year 2100, our public and private institutions, from pre-kindergarten, through college, will accommodate an estimated 94 million American children and young adults, an increase of over 40 million over the current school population.

Our schools are already severely overcrowded, with many forced to accept twice their capacity and open portable classrooms. According to a 2000 report from the National Center for Educational Statistics, 36 percent of schools had to use portable classrooms to accommodate growing student populations.

I've also heard reports that some schools are requiring and asking students to actually sit on desks and on teachers desks due to the overcrowding in classrooms. This is not an environment for learning for our children, and they deserve much better.

Since students in overcrowded classrooms lack quality one-on-one time

with their teachers, their academic skills suffer. Research shows that smaller class sizes significantly increase the amount of learning that takes place, reducing disciplinary problems and improving teacher productivity.

Smaller classes also particularly benefit students from low-income or disadvantaged backgrounds. For example, lowering class sizes in Tennessee closed the achievement gap between black students and white students by 38 percent.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, "A growing body of research demonstrates that students attending small classes in early grades make more rapid educational progress than students in larger classes, and that these achievement gains persist well after the students move on to larger classes in later grades."

One of the most well known conclusive studies on class size is Project STAR, the only large-scale controlled study of the effects of reduced class size that was conducted in 79 elementary schools in the State of Tennessee. According to the results from this study, 72 percent of students graduate on time in smaller class sizes, versus 66 percent from regular class sizes. Children in smaller class sizes complete more advanced math and English courses, and the drop-out rate is at least 4 percent lower in schools with smaller classes.

Our children deserve the individualized attention and instruction afforded by small class sizes. As we consider legislation today to usher our schools into the 21st Century, we should, at the very least, consider how new technologies and building designs can accommodate smaller class sizes, which is what my amendment would do.

My amendment is very simple. It provides that local education agencies may use a grant for modernization, renovation or repair of public school facilities to help reduce class sizes. Students and teachers deserve better than shared and portable classrooms. It's time we do something to help ensure our students receive the individualized attention they need, to help teachers in maintaining an orderly classroom.

In addition to building new modern schools with minimal environmental impact, we should build schools for the 21st Century equipped with technology and modern equipment that accommodates small class sizes that are safe for teaching and encourage learning.

Madam Chairman, this amendment is simple. It is straightforward, and has been endorsed by the National Education Association. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Chairman, I claim time in opposition, but I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDEE. We've looked over the Reichert amendment and we accept the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REICHERT. I thank the gentleman for his support, and I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1915

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 110-678 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. KILDEE of Michigan.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. EHLERS of Michigan.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. WELCH of Vermont.

Amendment No. 7 by Mr. MATHESON of Utah.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 151, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 374]

AYES—260

Abercrombie	Carnahan	Diaz-Balart, M.
Ackerman	Carson	Dicks
Allen	Castor	Dingell
Altmire	Cazayoux	Doggett
Arcuri	Chandler	Donnelly
Baca	Childers	Doyle
Baird	Christensen	Edwards
Baldwin	Clarke	Ehlers
Barrow	Clay	Ellison
Bean	Cleaver	Ellsworth
Becerra	Clyburn	Emanuel
Berkley	Cohen	Engel
Berman	Conyers	English (PA)
Berry	Cooper	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Costa	Etheridge
Bishop (NY)	Costello	Farr
Blumenauer	Courtney	Fattah
Bordallo	Cramer	Fortenberry
Boren	Crowley	Fortuño
Boswell	Cuellar	Fossella
Boyd (FL)	Davis (AL)	Foster
Boyd (KS)	Davis (CA)	Frank (MA)
Brady (PA)	Davis (IL)	Gerlach
Braley (IA)	Davis, Lincoln	Giffords
Brown, Corrine	Davis, Tom	Gonzalez
Buchanan	DeFazio	Gordon
Butterfield	DeGette	Green, Al
Capito	Delahunt	Green, Gene
Capps	DeLauro	Gutierrez
Capuano	Dent	Hall (NY)
Cardoza	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hare

Harman	McHugh	Schwartz	Rogers (AL)	Shadegg	Walberg
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Scott (GA)	Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Walden (OR)
Herseht Sandlin	McNerney	Scott (VA)	Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Wamp
Higgins	McNulty	Serrano	Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Weldon (FL)
Hill	Meek (FL)	Sestak	Roskam	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Hinchee	Meeks (NY)	Shays	Ryan (WI)	Souder	Wilson (SC)
Hinojosa	Melancon	Shea-Porter	Sali	Sullivan	Wittman (VA)
Hirono	Michaud	Sherman	Saxton	Tancredo	Wolf
Hobson	Miller (MI)	Shimkus	Scalise	Terry	Young (AK)
Hodes	Miller (NC)	Sires	Schmidt	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Holden	Miller, George	Skelton	Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt	
Holt	Mitchell	Slaughter	Sessions	Tiberi	
Honda	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)			
Hookey	Moore (KS)	Smith (WA)			
Hoyer	Moore (WI)	Snyder			
Inslee	Murphy (CT)	Solis			
Israel	Murphy, Patrick	Space			
Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Tim	Speier			
Jefferson	Murtha	Spratt			
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Stark			
Johnson (IL)	Napolitano	Stearns			
Johnson, E. B.	Neal (MA)	Stupak			
Jones (OH)	Oberstar	Sutton			
Kagen	Obey	Tanner			
Kanjorski	Oliver	Tauscher			
Kaptur	Ortiz	Taylor			
Kennedy	Pallone	Thompson (CA)			
Kildee	Pascrell	Thompson (MS)			
Kind	Pastor	Tierney			
King (NY)	Payne	Towns			
Kirk	Perlmutter	Tsongas			
Klein (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Turner			
Kuhl (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Udall (CO)			
LaHood	Platts	Udall (NM)			
Lampson	Porter	Upton			
Langevin	Price (NC)	Velazquez			
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Visclosky			
LaTourette	Ramstad	Walsh (NY)			
Lee	Rangel	Walz (MN)			
Levin	Reichert	Wasserman			
Lipinski	Reyes	Schultz			
LoBiondo	Richardson	Waters			
Loeb sack	Rodriguez	Watson			
Lofgren, Zoe	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt			
Lowey	Ross	Waxman			
Lynch	Rothman	Weiner			
Mahoney (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Welch (VT)			
Maloney (NY)	Royce	Weller			
Markey	Ruppersberger	Wexler			
Marshall	Ryan (OH)	Whitefield (KY)			
Matheson	Salazar	Wilson (NM)			
Matsui	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (OH)			
McCarthy (NY)	T. Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey			
McCaul (TX)	Sarbanes	Wu			
McCollum (MN)	Schakowsky	Yarmuth			
McDermott	Schiff				
McGovern					

NOES—151

Akin	Doolittle	Lamborn
Alexander	Drake	Latham
Bachmann	Dreier	Latta
Bachus	Duncan	Lewis (CA)
Barrett (SC)	Emerson	Lewis (KY)
Bartlett (MD)	Everett	Linder
Barton (TX)	Fallin	Lucas
Biggert	Feeney	Lungren, Daniel
Bilbray	Ferguson	E.
Bilirakis	Flake	Mack
Blackburn	Forbes	Manzullo
Blunt	Fox	Marchant
Boehner	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (CA)
Bonner	Frelinghuysen	McCotter
Bono Mack	Garrett (NJ)	McHenry
Boozman	Gingrey	McKeon
Boustany	Gohmert	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Goode	Rodgers
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Mica
Brown (SC)	Granger	Miller (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Miller, Gary
Ginny	Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Musgrave
Burton (IN)	Hayes	Myrick
Buyer	Heller	Neugebauer
Calvert	Hensarling	Nunes
Camp (MI)	Herger	Paul
Cannon	Hoekstra	Pearce
Cantor	Hulshof	Pence
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Petri
Castle	Issa	Pickering
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Pitts
Cole (OK)	Jones (NC)	Poe
Conaway	Jordan	Price (GA)
Crenshaw	Keller	Putnam
Cubin	King (IA)	Radanovich
Culberson	Kingston	Regula
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Rehberg
Davis, David	Knollenberg	Renzi
Deal (GA)	Kucinich	Reynolds

Rogers (AL)	Shadegg	Walberg
Rogers (KY)	Shuster	Walden (OR)
Rogers (MI)	Simpson	Wamp
Rohrabacher	Smith (NE)	Weldon (FL)
Roskam	Smith (TX)	Westmoreland
Ryan (WI)	Souder	Wilson (SC)
Sali	Sullivan	Wittman (VA)
Saxton	Tancredo	Wolf
Scalise	Terry	Young (AK)
Schmidt	Thornberry	Young (FL)
Sensenbrenner	Tiahrt	
Sessions	Tiberi	

NOT VOTING—27

Aderholt	Gallegly	McCrery
Andrews	Gilchrest	Moran (VA)
Bishop (UT)	Gillibrand	Norton
Boucher	Grijalva	Pomeroy
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Pryce (OH)
Carney	Jackson-Lee	Rush
Chabot	(TX)	Shuler
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Van Hollen
Faleomavaega	Larson (CT)	
Filner	Lewis (GA)	

□ 1941

Messrs. DAVIS of Illinois, ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, SHIMKUS and Mrs. CAPITO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall 374, I was unable to vote because of delays in my air travel. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. EHLERS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 397, noes 17, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 375]

AYES—397

Abercrombie	Bilbray	Brown, Corrine
Ackerman	Bilirakis	Brown-Waite,
Aderholt	Bishop (GA)	Ginny
Akin	Bishop (NY)	Buchanan
Alexander	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Allen	Blackburn	Burton (IN)
Altmire	Blunt	Butterfield
Arcuri	Boehner	Buyer
Baca	Bonner	Calvert
Bachmann	Bono Mack	Camp (MI)
Bachus	Boozman	Cannon
Baird	Bordallo	Cantor
Barrett (SC)	Boren	Capito
Barrow	Boswell	Capps
Bartlett (MD)	Boustany	Capuano
Barton (TX)	Boyd (FL)	Cardoza
Bean	Boyda (KS)	Carnahan
Becerra	Brady (PA)	Carson
Berkley	Brady (TX)	Carter
Berman	Braley (IA)	Castle
Berry	Broun (GA)	Castor
Biggert	Brown (SC)	Cazayoux

Chandler	Hobson	Musgrave	Thompson (MS)	Walberg	Weller	Boyda (KS)	Frelinghuysen	Matsui																																																																																																																					
Childers	Hodes	Myrick	Thornberry	Walden (OR)	Westmoreland	Brady (PA)	Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)																																																																																																																					
Christensen	Hoekstra	Nadler	Tiahrt	Walsh (NY)	Wexler	Brady (TX)	Gerlach	McCaul (TX)																																																																																																																					
Cleaver	Holden	Napolitano	Tiberi	Walz (MN)	Whitfield (KY)	Braley (IA)	Giffords	McCollum (MN)																																																																																																																					
Clyburn	Holt	Neal (MA)	Tierney	Wamp	Wilson (NM)	Broun (GA)	Gingrey	McCotter																																																																																																																					
Coble	Honda	Neugebauer	Towns	Wasserman	Wilson (OH)	Brown (SC)	Gohmert	McDermott																																																																																																																					
Cohen	Hooley	Nunes	Tsongas	Schultz	Wilson (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Gonzalez	McGovern																																																																																																																					
Cole (OK)	Hoyer	Oberstar	Turner	Waters	Wittman (VA)	Brown-Waite,	Goode	McHenry																																																																																																																					
Conaway	Hulshof	Obey	Udall (CO)	Watson	Wolf	Ginny	Goodlatte	McHugh																																																																																																																					
Conyers	Inglis (SC)	Oliver	Udall (NM)	Watt	Wu	Buchanan	Gordon	McIntyre																																																																																																																					
Cooper	Inslee	Ortiz	Upton	Waxman	Yarmuth	Burgess	Granger	McKeon																																																																																																																					
Costa	Israel	Pallone	Velázquez	Welch (VT)	Young (AK)	Burton (IN)	Graves	McMorris																																																																																																																					
Costello	Issa	Pascrell	Visclosky	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)	Butterfield	Green, Al	Rodgers																																																																																																																					
Courtney	Jefferson	Pastor				Buyer	Green, Gene	McNerney																																																																																																																					
Cramer	Johnson (GA)	Paul				Calvert	Gutierrez	McNulty																																																																																																																					
Crenshaw	Johnson (IL)	Payne	Baldwin	Johnson, E. B.	Sherman	Camp (MI)	Hall (NY)	Meek (FL)																																																																																																																					
Crowley	Johnson, Sam	Pearce	Blumenauer	Kirk	Speier	Cannon	Hall (TX)	Meeks (NY)																																																																																																																					
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Pence	Clay	Lipinski	Stark	Cantor	Hare	Melancon																																																																																																																					
Cuellar	Jones (OH)	Perlmutter	Emanuel	Moore (WI)	Weiner	Capito	Harman	Mica																																																																																																																					
Culberson	Jordan	Peterson (MN)	Gonzalez	Ros-Lehtinen	Woolsey	Capps	Hastings (FL)	Michaud																																																																																																																					
Cummings	Kagen	Peterson (PA)	Jackson (IL)	Schakowsky		Capuano	Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)																																																																																																																					
Davis (AL)	Kanjorski	Petri				Cardoza	Hayes	Miller (MI)																																																																																																																					
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Pickering				Carnahan	Heller	Miller (NC)																																																																																																																					
Davis (IL)	Keller	Pitts	Andrews	Gilchrest	Moran (VA)	Carson	Hensarling	Miller, Gary																																																																																																																					
Davis (KY)	Kennedy	Platts	Boucher	Gillibrand	Norton	Carter	Herger	Miller, George																																																																																																																					
Davis, David	Kildee	Poe	Campbell (CA)	Gutierrez	Pryce (OH)	Castle	Herseth Sandlin	Mitchell																																																																																																																					
Davis, Lincoln	Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Carney	Hunter	Rangel	Castor	Higgins	Mollohan																																																																																																																					
Davis, Tom	Kind	Porter	Chabot	Jackson-Lee	Rush	Cazaayoux	Hill	Moore (KS)																																																																																																																					
Deal (GA)	King (IA)	Price (GA)	Clarke	(TX)	Shuler	Chandler	Hinchee	Moore (WI)																																																																																																																					
DeFazio	King (NY)	Price (NC)	Faleomavaega	Lewis (GA)	Van Hollen	Childers	Hinojosa	Moran (KS)																																																																																																																					
DeGette	Kingston	Putnam	Filner	McCrery		Christensen	Moran (VA)	Moran (VA)																																																																																																																					
Delahunt	Klein (FL)	Radanovich	Gallegly	Meeks (NY)		Clarke	Hobson	Murphy (CT)																																																																																																																					
DeLauro	Kline (MN)	Rahall				Clay	Hodes	Murphy, Patrick																																																																																																																					
Dent	Knollenberg	Ramstad				Cleaver	Hoekstra	Murphy, Tim																																																																																																																					
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kucinich	Regula				Clyburn	Holden	Murtha																																																																																																																					
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Rehberg				Coble	Holt	Musgrave																																																																																																																					
Dicks	LaHood	Reichert				Cohen	Honda	Myrick																																																																																																																					
Dingell	Lamborn	Renzi				Cole (OK)	Hooley	Nadler																																																																																																																					
Doggett	Lampson	Reyes				Conaway	Hoyer	Napolitano																																																																																																																					
Donnelly	Langevin	Reynolds				Conyers	Hulshof	Neal (MA)																																																																																																																					
Doolittle	Larsen (WA)	Richardson				Cooper	Inglis (SC)	Neugebauer																																																																																																																					
Doyle	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez				Costa	Inslee	Nunes																																																																																																																					
Drake	Latham	Rogers (AL)				Costello	Israel	Oberstar																																																																																																																					
Dreier	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)				Courtney	Issa	Obey																																																																																																																					
Duncan	Latta	Rogers (MI)				Cramer	Jackson (IL)	Olver																																																																																																																					
Edwards	Lee	Rohrabacher				Crenshaw	Jefferson	Ortiz																																																																																																																					
Ehlers	Levin	Roskam				Crowley	Johnson (GA)	Pallone																																																																																																																					
Ellison	Lewis (CA)	Ross				Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Pascrell																																																																																																																					
Ellsworth	Lewis (KY)	Rothman				Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor																																																																																																																					
Emerson	Linder	Roybal-Allard				Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Payne																																																																																																																					
Engel	LoBiondo	Royce				Cummings	Jones (NC)	Pearce																																																																																																																					
English (PA)	Loeback	Ruppersberger				Davis (AL)	Jones (OH)	Pence																																																																																																																					
Eshoo	Lofgren, Zoe	Ryan (OH)				Davis (CA)	Jordan	Perlmutter																																																																																																																					
Etheridge	Lowe	Ryan (WI)				Davis (IL)	Kagen	Peterson (MN)																																																																																																																					
Everett	Lucas	Salazar				Davis (KY)	Kanjorski	Peterson (PA)																																																																																																																					
Fallin	Lungren, Daniel	Sali				Davis, David	Kaptur	Petri																																																																																																																					
Farr	E.	Sánchez, Linda				Davis, Lincoln	Keller	Pickering																																																																																																																					
Fattah	Lynch	T.				Davis, Tom	Kennedy	Pitts																																																																																																																					
Feeney	Mack	Sanchez, Loretta				Deal (GA)	Kildee	Platts																																																																																																																					
Ferguson	Mahoney (FL)	Sarbanes				DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Poe																																																																																																																					
Flake	Maloney (NY)	Saxton				DeGette	Kind	Pomeroy																																																																																																																					
Forbes	Manzullo	Scalise				DeGette	Kind	Porter																																																																																																																					
Fortenberry	Marchant	Schiff				Delahunt	King (IA)	Price (GA)																																																																																																																					
Fortuno	Markey	Schmidt				DeLauro	King (NY)	Price (NC)																																																																																																																					
Fossella	Marshall	Schwartz				Dent	Kingston	Putnam																																																																																																																					
Foster	Matheson	Scott (GA)				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kirk	Radanovich																																																																																																																					
Fox	Matsui	Scott (VA)				Diaz-Balart, M.	Klein (FL)	Rahall																																																																																																																					
Frank (MA)	McCarthy (CA)	Sensenbrenner				Dicks	Kline (MN)	Ramstad																																																																																																																					
Franks (AZ)	McCarthy (NY)	Serrano				Dingell	Knollenberg	Rangel																																																																																																																					
Frelinghuysen	McCaul (TX)	Sessions				Doggett	Kucinich	Regula																																																																																																																					
Garrett (NJ)	McCollum (MN)	Sestak				Donnelly	Kuhl (NY)	Rehberg																																																																																																																					
Gerlach	McCotter	Shadegg				Doolittle	LaHood	Reichert																																																																																																																					
Giffords	McDermott	Shays				Doyle	Lamborn	Renzi																																																																																																																					
Gingrey	McGovern	Shea-Porter				Drake	Lampson	Reyes																																																																																																																					
Gohmert	McHenry	Shimkus				Dreier	Langevin	Royce																																																																																																																					
Goode	McHugh	Shuster				Duncan	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger																																																																																																																					
Goodlatte	McIntyre	Simpson				Edwards	Larson (CT)	Rodriguez																																																																																																																					
Gordon	McKeon	Sires				Ehlers	Latham	Rogers (AL)																																																																																																																					
Granger	McMorris	Skelton				Ellison	LaTourette	Rogers (KY)																																																																																																																					
Graves	Rodgers	Slaughter				Ellsworth	Latta	Rogers (MI)																																																																																																																					
Green, Al	McNerney	Smith (NE)				Emanuel	Lee	Rohrabacher																																																																																																																					
Green, Gene	McNulty	Smith (NJ)				Emerson	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen																																																																																																																					
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Smith (TX)				Engel	Lewis (CA)	Roskam																																																																																																																					
Hall (NY)	Melancon	Smith (WA)				English (PA)	Lewis (KY)	Ross																																																																																																																					
Hall (TX)	Mica	Snyder				Eshoo	Lipinski	Rothman																																																																																																																					
Hare	Michaud	Solis				Etheridge	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard																																																																																																																					
Harman	Miller (FL)	Souder				Everett	Loeback	Royce </tr <tr> <td>Hastings (FL)</td><td>Miller (MI)</td><td>Space</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Fallin</td><td>Lofgren, Zoe</td><td>Ruppersberger</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hastings (WA)</td><td>Miller (NC)</td><td>Spratt</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Farr</td><td>Lowey</td><td>Ryan (OH)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hayes</td><td>Miller, Gary</td><td>Stearns</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Fattah</td><td>Lucas</td><td>Ryan (WI)</td></tr> <tr> <td>Heller</td><td>Miller, George</td><td>Stupak</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Feeney</td><td>Lungren, Daniel</td><td>Salazar</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hensarling</td><td>Mitchell</td><td>Sullivan</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Ferguson</td><td>E.</td><td>Sali</td></tr> <tr> <td>Herger</td><td>Mollohan</td><td>Sutton</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Forbes</td><td>Lynch</td><td>Sánchez, Linda</td></tr> <tr> <td>Herseth Sandlin</td><td>Moore (KS)</td><td>Tancredo</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Fortenberry</td><td>Mack</td><td>T.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Higgins</td><td>Moore (KS)</td><td>Tanner</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Fortuno</td><td>Mahoney (FL)</td><td>Sanchez, Loretta</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hill</td><td>Murphy (CT)</td><td>Tauscher</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Fossella</td><td>Maloney (NY)</td><td>Sarbanes</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hinchee</td><td>Murphy, Patrick</td><td>Taylor</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Foster</td><td>Manzullo</td><td>Saxton</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hinojosa</td><td>Murphy, Tim</td><td>Terry</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Fox</td><td>Markey</td><td>Scalise</td></tr> <tr> <td>Hirono</td><td>Murtha</td><td>Thompson (CA)</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Frank (MA)</td><td>Marshall</td><td>Schakowsky</td></tr> <tr> <td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Franks (AZ)</td><td>Matheson</td><td></td></tr>	Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)	Space				Fallin	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger	Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)	Spratt				Farr	Lowey	Ryan (OH)	Hayes	Miller, Gary	Stearns				Fattah	Lucas	Ryan (WI)	Heller	Miller, George	Stupak				Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Salazar	Hensarling	Mitchell	Sullivan				Ferguson	E.	Sali	Herger	Mollohan	Sutton				Forbes	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda	Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Tancredo				Fortenberry	Mack	T.	Higgins	Moore (KS)	Tanner				Fortuno	Mahoney (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Hill	Murphy (CT)	Tauscher				Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Sarbanes	Hinchee	Murphy, Patrick	Taylor				Foster	Manzullo	Saxton	Hinojosa	Murphy, Tim	Terry				Fox	Markey	Scalise	Hirono	Murtha	Thompson (CA)				Frank (MA)	Marshall	Schakowsky							Franks (AZ)	Matheson	
Hastings (FL)	Miller (MI)	Space				Fallin	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger																																																																																																																					
Hastings (WA)	Miller (NC)	Spratt				Farr	Lowey	Ryan (OH)																																																																																																																					
Hayes	Miller, Gary	Stearns				Fattah	Lucas	Ryan (WI)																																																																																																																					
Heller	Miller, George	Stupak				Feeney	Lungren, Daniel	Salazar																																																																																																																					
Hensarling	Mitchell	Sullivan				Ferguson	E.	Sali																																																																																																																					
Herger	Mollohan	Sutton				Forbes	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda																																																																																																																					
Herseth Sandlin	Moore (KS)	Tancredo				Fortenberry	Mack	T.																																																																																																																					
Higgins	Moore (KS)	Tanner				Fortuno	Mahoney (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta																																																																																																																					
Hill	Murphy (CT)	Tauscher				Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Sarbanes																																																																																																																					
Hinchee	Murphy, Patrick	Taylor				Foster	Manzullo	Saxton																																																																																																																					
Hinojosa	Murphy, Tim	Terry				Fox	Markey	Scalise																																																																																																																					
Hirono	Murtha	Thompson (CA)				Frank (MA)	Marshall	Schakowsky																																																																																																																					
						Franks (AZ)	Matheson																																																																																																																						

NOES—17

NOT VOTING—24

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote).
Two minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1949

Ms. BALDWIN changed her vote from
“aye” to “no.”

Mr. BARROW changed his vote from
“no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rolcall
375, I was unable to vote because of delays
in my air travel. Had I been present, I would
have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF
VERMONT

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has
been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 409, noes 5,
not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 376]

AYES—409

Abercrombie	Barrett (SC)	Bishop (NY)
Ackerman	Barrow	Blackburn
Aderholt	Bartlett (MD)	Blumenauer
Akin	Barton (TX)	Blunt
Alexander	Bean	Boehner
Allen	Becerra	Bonner
Altmire	Berkley	Bono Mack
Arcuri	Berman	Boozman
Baca	Berry	Bordallo
Bachmann	Biggert	Boren
Bachus	Bilbray	Boswell
Baird	Bilirakis	Boustany
Baldwin	Bishop (GA)	Boyd (FL)

Schiff	Space	Walberg	Bishop (GA)	Herseth Sandlin	Pallone	Davis, David	Kingston	Reynolds
Schmidt	Speier	Walden (OR)	Bishop (NY)	Higgins	Pascarell	Davis, Tom	Kline (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Schwartz	Spratt	Walsh (NY)	Bishop (UT)	Hill	Pastor	Deal (GA)	Knollenberg	Rogers (KY)
Scott (GA)	Stark	Walz (MN)	Blumenauer	Hinchey	Payne	Diaz-Balart, L.	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Scott (VA)	Stearns	Wamp	Bordallo	Hinojosa	Pearce	Diaz-Balart, M.	Latham	Rohrabacher
Sensenbrenner	Stupak	Wasserman	Boren	Hirono	Perlmutter	Doolittle	Latta	Roskam
Serrano	Sullivan	Schultz	Boswell	Hodes	Peterson (MN)	Drake	Lewis (CA)	Royce
Sessions	Sutton	Watson	Boyd (FL)	Holden	Platts	Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)
Sestak	Tancredo	Watt	Boyda (KS)	Holt	Pomeroy	Duncan	Linder	Sali
Shadegg	Tanner	Waxman	Brady (PA)	Honda	Porter	Emerson	Lucas	Scalise
Shays	Tauscher	Weiner	Braley (IA)	Hooley	Price (NC)	Everett	Lungren, Daniel	Schmidt
Shea-Porter	Taylor	Welch (VT)	Brown, Corrine	Hoyer	Rahall	Fallin	E.	Sensenbrenner
Sherman	Terry	Weldon (FL)	Buchanan	Inslee	Ramstad	Feeney	Mack	Sessions
Shinkus	Thompson (CA)	Weller	Butterfield	Israel	Rangel	Flake	Manzullo	Shadegg
Shuster	Thompson (MS)	Westmoreland	Capito	Jackson (IL)	Reichert	Forbes	Marchant	Shimkus
Simpson	Thornberry	Wexler	Capps	Jefferson	Renzi	Fossella	McCarthy (CA)	Shuster
Sires	Tiahrt	Whitfield (KY)	Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Reyes	Fox	McCotter	Simpson
Skelton	Tiberi	Wilson (NM)	Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Richardson	Franks (AZ)	McHugh	Smith (NE)
Slaughter	Tierney	Wilson (OH)	Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez	Garrett (NJ)	McKeon	Smith (TX)
Smith (NE)	Towns	Wilson (SC)	Carson	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen	Gingrey	McMorris	Souder
Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Wittman (VA)	Castle	Jones (OH)	Ross	Gohmert	Rodgers	Stearns
Smith (TX)	Turner	Wolf	Castor	Kagen	Rothman	Goode	Mica	Sullivan
Smith (WA)	Udall (CO)	Woolsey	Cazayoux	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Tancredo
Snyder	Udall (NM)	Wu	Chandler	Kaptur	Ruppersberger	Granger	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
Solis	Upton	Yarmuth	Childers	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)	Graves	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt
Souder	Visclosky	Young (FL)	Christensen	Kildee	Salazar	Hall (TX)	Myrick	Tiberi
			Clarke	Kilpatrick	Sánchez, Linda	Hastings (WA)	Neugebauer	Upton
			Clay	Kirk	T.	Heller	Nunes	Walberg
			Cleaver	Klein (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta	Hensarling	Paul	Walden (OR)
			Clyburn	Kucinich	Sarbanes	Herger	Pence	Walsh (NY)
			Cohen	Kuhl (NY)	Saxton	Hobson	Peterson (PA)	Wamp
			Conyers	LaHood	Schakowsky	Hoekstra	Petri	Weldon (FL)
			Cooper	Lampson	Schiff	Hulshof	Pickering	Westmoreland
			Costa	Langevin	Inglis (SC)	Pitts	Whitfield (KY)	Wilson (NM)
			Costello	Larsen (WA)	Issa	Poe	Wilson (SC)	Wittman (VA)
			Courtney	Larson (CT)	Jones (NC)	Price (GA)	Wolf	
			Cramer	LaTourette	Jordan	Putnam	Young (AK)	
			Crowley	Lee	Keller	Radanovich	Young (FL)	
			Cuellar	Levin	King (IA)	Regula		
			Culberson	Lipinski	King (NY)	Rehberg		
			Cummings	LoBiondo				
			Davis (AL)	Loebback				
			Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe				
			Davis (IL)	Lowey				
			Davis, Lincoln	Lynch				
			DeFazio	Mahoney (FL)				
			DeGette	Maloney (NY)				
			DeLauro	Markey				
			Dent	Marshall				
			Dicks	Matheson				
			Dingell	Matsui				
			Doggett	McCarthy (NY)				
			Donnelly	McCaul (TX)				
			Doyle	McCollum (MN)				
			Edwards	McDermott				
			Ehlers	McGovern				
			Ellison	McHenry				
			Ellsworth	McIntyre				
			Emanuel	McNerney				
			Engel	McNulty				
			English (PA)	Meek (FL)				
			Eshoo	Meeks (NY)				
			Etheridge	Melancon				
			Farr	Michael				
			Fattah	Miller (MI)				
			Ferguson	Miller (NC)				
			Fortenberry	Miller, George				
			Fortuño	Mitchell				
			Foster	Mollohan				
			Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)				
			Frelinghuysen	Moore (WI)				
			Gerlach	Moran (VA)				
			Giffords	Murphy (CT)				
			Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick				
			Gordon	Murphy, Tim				
			Green, Al	Murtha				
			Green, Gene	Musgrave				
			Grijalva	Nadler				
			Gutierrez	Napolitano				
			Hall (NY)	Neal (MA)				
			Hare	Oberstar				
			Harman	Obey				
			Hastings (FL)	Oliver				
			Hayes	Ortiz				

NOES—5

Flake	Marchant	Young (AK)
Linder	Paul	

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews	Gilchrest	Norton
Bishop (UT)	Gillibrand	Pryce (OH)
Boucher	Grijalva	Rush
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Shuler
Carney	Jackson-Lee	Van Hollen
Chabot	(TX)	Velázquez
Faleomavaega	Lewis (GA)	Waters
Filner	McCarthy (NY)	
Gallely	McCrery	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1957

Messrs. ROYCE and WELDON of Florida changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall 376, I was unable to vote because of delays in my air travel. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 153, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

AYES—266

Abercrombie	Baca	Becerra
Ackerman	Baird	Berkley
Allen	Baldwin	Berman
Altmire	Barrow	Berry
Arcuri	Bean	Biggert

NOES—153

Aderholt	Boehner	Buyer
Akin	Bonner	Calvert
Alexander	Bono Mack	Camp (MI)
Bachmann	Boozman	Cannon
Bachus	Boustany	Cantor
Barrett (SC)	Brady (TX)	Carter
Bartlett (MD)	Brown (GA)	Coble
Barton (TX)	Brown (SC)	Cole (OK)
Bilbray	Brown-Waite,	Conaway
Bilirakis	Ginny	Crenshaw
Blackburn	Burgess	Cubin
Blunt	Burton (IN)	Davis (KY)

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Gallely	McCrery
Boucher	Gilchrest	Norton
Campbell (CA)	Gillibrand	Pryce (OH)
Carney	Hunter	Rush
Chabot	Jackson-Lee	Shuler
Faleomavaega	(TX)	Van Hollen
Filner	Lewis (GA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 2004

Mrs. CAPITO and Mr. CULBERSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Madam Chairman, on rollcall 377, I was unable to vote because of delays in my air travel. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POMEROY) having assumed the chair, Ms. BORDALLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3021) to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants and low-interest loans to local educational agencies for the construction, modernization, or repair of public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1234, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MRS.
MCMORRIS RODGERS

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. I am, in its present form, sir.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. McMorris Rodgers of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3021 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly in the form to which perfected at the time of this motion, with the following amendment:

Page 11, line 25, before the semicolon, insert the following: “, except that a local educational agency whose energy expenditures have increased by at least 50 percent since January 4, 2007, may pay maintenance costs for any of the activities described in section 103”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, schools, like everyone in America, are facing an immediate financial crunch, not because schools don't have enough funding for green maintenance, but, rather, they can't afford the rising cost of energy.

The high cost of energy is affecting schools in many ways. Some schools are moving to a 4-day school week to save fuel and energy costs. Busing service is being cut back because it's so costly to fuel school buses. Field trips, sporting events, and after-school activities are being limited. School lunches cost more. School supplies cost more.

Yet the bill before us does nothing to reduce the cost of gasoline, diesel, heating oil, electricity, or any other energy cost. That's because the Democrats refuse to unveil their “common-sense plan” for bringing down energy costs.

What the motion to recommit proposes is simple: We want to let schools use these funds where they are needed. For many schools they need help with their energy costs.

Currently, schools are prohibited from using funds under this bill for “maintenance.” Instead, these taxpayer dollars are supposed to go exclusively for renovation and modernization.

The motion to recommit says that any school whose energy costs have risen by 50 percent since the 110th Congress gavelled into session, these funds can be used for school maintenance in addition to other initiatives.

At the start of this school year, the Reardan-Edwall School District, in Eastern Washington, was paying \$2.88 per gallon for diesel. They are now paying almost double, \$4.93 per gallon. So what are they doing? They are trying to decide between additional teachers, textbooks, and supplies or the diesel needed to get the kids to school.

School budgets are being squeezed and stretched like never before. Instead of reducing flexibility for schools to use this money as they see fit, this bill imposes a heavy-handed big government approach that limits local control.

Schools, like all of us, need energy relief. Americans are concerned about energy costs, and they want us to unleash American ingenuity. The vast majority, 70 percent now, say we should develop gas and oil in America.

In addition, the United States is rich in oil shale with deposits located in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Wyoming. These reserves contain energy equivalent to 2 to 3 trillion barrels of oil. To put this into perspective, the world has used 1 trillion barrels of oil since the first well was successfully drilled in Pennsylvania in 1859.

Developing our energy resources is an important step in the long-term strategy of reducing our dependence on foreign oil. We can and we must start meeting America's energy needs with American resources.

Join me in giving schools energy relief. The motion to recommit will ensure this bill gives it to them.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, all day long we have had an interesting double argument here from my colleagues on the other side. All day long they have insisted that school districts are in trouble because of increased energy costs, because of the increased cost of electricity, natural gas, air conditioning, heating, fuel for the buses, and all the rest of it. And they have spent all day long arguing against a bill that's designed exactly to deal with the energy costs of those schools, by helping those districts to refurbish, to rebuild, to remodel, to reconstruct old facilities that do not use energy efficiently, that do not have state-of-the-art facilities for the conservation of energy, for the better use of energy.

We are giving out tax cuts and have for many years in a very sensible program to help businesses come into the modern age in energy. Businesses, homeowners, and others are reaping huge savings. But schools aren't.

So this bill simply says that the Federal Government will join in a partner-

ship with local districts who have already set out their priorities to provide for energy efficiency, to provide for new technologies so that they can provide the best learning environment for the children in those school districts. And when they do that, what we're seeing across the country is those schools that are fortunate enough to have the money are dramatically reducing the amount of their budgets that go to energy and they can use that on curriculum or extracurricular activities or teacher pay or whatever else it is.

□ 2015

But most schools can't afford to do that. And so what we are saying is we will simply partner up with those districts most in need and see if we can help them reduce their energy budgets over the years so they can put it into education. That is the bill that Mr. CHANDLER introduced. That is the bill that is designed and has been voted on on this floor today, because that is the need of the school districts. That is why the school districts, the State Superintendents of Schools, local school districts, are supporting this legislation, because it meets the need they have.

Now somehow after arguing all day long that this is too heavy of a hand, we now see an amendment that we've never seen in committee, we didn't see on the floor, we didn't see in Rules Committee, that is suggesting somehow we just pay the ongoing maintenance cost of the districts. I don't know if that is what you wanted to sign up for. We thought we'd sign up to be a partner in district priorities to refurbish and rehab schools and improve the energy efficiency of those based upon the district policies. I didn't know we were going to sign up for a long-term grant for the maintenance of school districts.

I would like to yield now to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CHANDLER).

Mr. CHANDLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This motion to recommit has absolutely nothing to do with this bill, nothing at all to do with this bill. This bill is about school construction. This bill allows our children to compete in a global economy. It helps them to compete. It is about energy efficiency. But it's about energy efficiency in our schools. It's about “green” schools. It's a very, very good bill. Plus, in addition to that, it creates at least 100,000 jobs, and they are jobs that will not and cannot be exported, like so many of our jobs have seen happen.

This bill is supported by almost every education body in the country. It's supported by the National School Board Association, it's supported by the PTA, it's supported by the NEA, the Principals' Associations throughout this country, it's supported by the

American Federation of Teachers, and the National School Administrators.

If the minority were really serious about this motion to recommit and about improving this bill, if they were serious about the cost of gasoline, if they were serious about doing something for the American people, and if they wanted to help the kids of this country, they wouldn't have made it a bill that would be reported back promptly. That is what they have done. They intend to kill the bill.

Please vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank my colleague.

All day long in this Chamber we have had amendment after amendment saying that if we weren't putting money into school construction to refurbish these schools in need, they would put it in IDEA, they would put it in title I, they would put it in after-school care, they would put it in monitoring. You know what? When they had the money and they were in control, they didn't put it anywhere.

They inherited a \$5 trillion surplus, a \$5 trillion surplus, and when they had the money, they didn't put it anywhere. Now we have a \$9 trillion debt and they still can't fund education. That is why we have got to stop it. We should reject this motion to recommit. This is enough to kill the bill. What we need is in fact more money for our schools.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. State your parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true if this motion were to pass, that this House could put the bill back into the committee from which it came and it could be brought out the next legislative day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair reaffirmed on November 15, 2007, at some subsequent time, the committee could meet and report the bill back to the House.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This 15-minute vote will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 230, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

AYES—187

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggart
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach

NOES—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney

Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Ingalls (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourrette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
McRodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul

Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
Loebbeck
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews
Boucher
Campbell (CA)
Chabot
Doolittle
Filner
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Lewis (GA)
McCrery
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Shuler
Van Hollen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2037

Mr. ISRAEL changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 378, I was unable to vote because of delays in my air travel. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa was allowed to speak out of order.)

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR VICTIMS OF IOWA TORNADOES

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 25, when many of us were enjoying the Memorial Day holiday, my district was hit with an F5 tornado that left a path of death and devastation in its wake. The cities of Parkersburg, New Hartford, Dunkerton, Hazleton and Lamont were the cities that were hit hardest. Eight people were killed, 350 people lost their homes, thousands more had their

Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill

homes severely damaged, and 50 businesses were destroyed, including 21 in the small town of Parkersburg alone.

I would ask at this time for a moment of silence for those who lost their lives and to remember the sacrifice that is being made right now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will rise and observe a moment of silence.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 250, nays 164, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—250

Abercrombie	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind
Ackerman	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk
Allen	Dicks	Klein (FL)
Altmire	Dingell	Kucinich
Arcuri	Doggett	Lampson
Baca	Donnelly	Langevin
Baird	Doyle	Larsen (WA)
Baldwin	Edwards	Larson (CT)
Barrow	Ellsworth	LaTourette
Bean	Emanuel	Lee
Becerra	Engel	Levin
Berkley	English (PA)	Lipinski
Berman	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Berry	Etheridge	Loeb sack
Bishop (GA)	Farr	Lofgren, Zoe
Bishop (NY)	Fattah	Lowe y
Blumenauer	Foster	Lynch
Boren	Frank (MA)	Mahoney (FL)
Boswell	Gerlach	Maloney (NY)
Boyd (FL)	Giffords	Mark ey
Boyd (KS)	Gonzalez	Marshall
Brady (PA)	Gordon	Matheson
Brown, Brine	Green, Al	Matsui
Butterfield	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)
Capps	Grijalva	McCa ul (TX)
Capuano	Gutierrez	McCollum (MN)
Cardoza	Hall (NY)	McDermott
Carnahan	Hare	McGovern
Carney	Harman	McHugh
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McIntyre
Castor	Hayes	McNerney
Cazayoux	Herseth Sandlin	McNulty
Chandler	Higgins	Meek (FL)
Childers	Hill	Meeks (NY)
Clarke	Hinche y	Melancon
Clay	Hinojosa	Micha ud
Cleaver	Hirono	Miller (MI)
Clyburn	Hodes	Miller (NC)
Cohen	Holden	Miller, George
Conyers	Holt	Mitchell
Cooper	Honda	Mollohan
Costa	Hooley	Moore (KS)
Costello	Hoyer	Moore (WI)
Courtney	Inslee	Moran (VA)
Cramer	Israel	Murphy (CT)
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Murphy, Patrick
Cuellar	Jefferson	Murphy, Tim
Cummings	Johnson (GA)	Murtha
Davis (AL)	Johnson (IL)	Nadler
Davis (CA)	Johnson, E. B.	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Jones (OH)	Neal (MA)
Davis, Lincoln	Kagen	Oberstar
Davis, Tom	Kanjorski	Obey
DeFazio	Kaptur	Olver
DeGette	Keller	Ortiz
Delahunt	Kennedy	Pallone
DeLauro	Kildee	Pascarell
Dent	Kilpatrick	Pastor

Payne	Saxton
Perlmutter	Schakowsky
Peterson (MN)	Schiff
Platts	Schwartz
Pomeroy	Scott (GA)
Porter	Scott (VA)
Price (NC)	Serrano
Rahall	Sestak
Ramstad	Shays
Rangel	Shea-Porter
Reichert	Sherman
Renzi	Sires
Reyes	Skelton
Richardson	Slaughter
Rodriguez	Smith (NJ)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (WA)
Ross	Snyder
Rothman	Solis
Roybal-Allard	Space
Ruppersberger	Speier
Ryan (OH)	Spratt
Salazar	Stark
Sanchez, Linda	Stupak
T.	Sutton
Sanchez, Loretta	Tanner
Sarbanes	Tauscher

NAYS—164

Aderholt	Fossella
Akin	Fox
Alexander	Franks (AZ)
Bachmann	Frelinghuysen
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)
Barrett (SC)	Gingrey
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert
Barton (TX)	Goode
Biggart	Goodlatte
Bilbray	Granger
Bilirakis	Graves
Bishop (UT)	Hall (TX)
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)
Blunt	Heller
Boehner	Hensarling
Bonner	Herger
Bono Mack	Hobson
Boozman	Hoekstra
Boustany	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Hunter
Broun (GA)	Inglis (SC)
Brown (SC)	Issa
Brown-Waite,	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	Jones (NC)
Buchanan	Jordan
Burgess	King (IA)
Burton (IN)	King (NY)
Buyer	Kingston
Calvert	Kline (MN)
Camp (MI)	Knollenberg
Cannon	Kuhl (NY)
Cantor	LaHood
Capito	Lamborn
Carter	Latham
Castle	Latta
Coble	Lewis (CA)
Cole (OK)	Lewis (KY)
Conaway	Linder
Crenshaw	Lucas
Cubin	Lungren, Daniel
Culberson	E.
Davis (KY)	Mack
Davis, David	Manzullo
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)
Drake	McCotter
Dreier	McHenry
Duncan	McKeon
Ehlers	McMorris
Emerson	Rodgers
Everett	Mica
Fallin	Miller (FL)
Feeney	Miller, Gary
Ferguson	Moran (KS)
Flake	Musgrave
Forbes	Myrick
Fortenberry	Neugebauer

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Filner	Marchant
Boucher	Gallagher	McCrery
Braley (IA)	Gilchrest	Pryce (OH)
Campbell (CA)	Gillibrand	Rush
Chabot	Jackson-Lee	Shuler
Doolittle	(TX)	Van Hollen
Ellison	Lewis (GA)	

□ 2046

Mrs. MUSGRAVE changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the modernization, renovation, or repair of public kindergarten, elementary, and secondary educational facilities, and for other purposes.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 379, I was unable to vote because of delays in my air travel. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 3021, 21ST CENTURY GREEN HIGH-PERFORMING PUBLIC SCHOOL FACILITIES ACT

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 3021, the Clerk be authorized to correct the table of contents, section numbers, punctuation, citations, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be appropriate to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HONORING THE NATIONAL CHAMPIONS FROM LEWIS CLARK STATE COLLEGE IN LEWISTON, IDAHO

(Mr. SALI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the national champions from Lewis Clark State College in Lewiston, Idaho.

Last week, the LCSC Warriors won the 52nd annual National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics championship World Series baseball game. It was LCSC's third straight win, and 16th since 1982, all under the leadership of Coach Ed Cheff. Lewis Clark State College can be proud of these men for an extraordinary win and the national recognition they are once again receiving. In fact, I was proud to recognize the fine athletes at LCSC by wearing their red, white, and blue uniform during the congressional baseball game last year.

Mr. Speaker, naturally I believe Idaho produces the best of everything. The best agriculture, the best companies, the best people, and, indeed, the best baseball players, originate in Idaho, and last week's win just proves the point. My congratulations to the Warriors, LCSC, and Lewiston, Idaho.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

JOHN BURL HULSEY, SR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an extraordinary American and a native of my congressional district, John Burl Hulsey, Sr., who was instrumental as a Navy pilot during World War II in the development of our Nation's first cruise missile.

While all of his friends are certainly aware of his service in the Navy, very few know that Lieutenant Commander Hulsey was one of the 48 Navy pilots hand-selected for this top secret mission. In fact, this project was so top secret that Lieutenant Commander Hulsey was prohibited from even discussing it with his wife, Mary Louise, until it was officially declassified in 1989.

During World War II, the United States Navy established two special squadrons which developed the Stand-off Guided Missile Forces, an experimental program designed to direct unmanned drone aircraft loaded with explosives into enemy targets. Remote-controlled drones, pilotless planes with a video camera mounted on their noses, were loaded with 2,000 pound bombs and directed to their targets by a trailing aircraft located several miles from the site of impact. Using radar guidance and wireless video transmission, this technology was state-of-the-art, futuristic technology in the early 1940s. For the first time in history, naval aviators were able to accurately strike high-profile, heavily defended installations while remaining out of danger.

Also termed the American Kamikaze, this mission set forth a powerful blow to the enemy, using tactics never before seen in modern warfare, undoubtedly changing the scope and the outcome of World War II as well as various conflicts which have followed.

In 1938, Lieutenant Commander Hulsey enrolled at North Georgia College, then a 2-year institution, prior to transferring to the University of Georgia in Athens for completion of his studies. While at the University of Georgia, Lieutenant Commander Hulsey participated in the university's civilian pilot training program, where he began preparing for a career in aviation. Immediately prior to entering his senior year at the University of Georgia, Lieutenant Commander Hulsey decided to enlist in the Navy, and was ordered to report for service shortly thereafter.

In addition to being stationed for training at naval air stations in Chamblee, Georgia, Pensacola, Florida, and New Orleans, he and other members of what were called STAG I spent several years in Clinton, Oklahoma and Traverse City, Michigan, where they conducted extensive testing and development of the drone project prior to deployment to the Pacific theater.

Finally, in May 1944, Lieutenant Commander Hulsey and many of his fellow STAG I pilots departed for the Russell Islands in the Solomon Island Chain, about 25 miles from Guadalcanal, where the Navy prepared to carry out a critical series of attacks on enemy strongholds across the region. Anti-aircraft fire was heavy at times around his plane and the drones which he followed, but he was, fortunately, never struck.

On September 27, 1944, the very first TDR-1 assault drone attack in combat was successfully carried out, marking an historic moment in the development and implementation of cruise missiles in warfare.

Of the 47 total attacks carried out by STAG I during their brief mission in the Pacific, an unprecedented 22 targets resulted in direct hits, including island caves loaded with enemy ammunition and anti-aircraft installations in the Shortland Islands, Bougainville, and Rabaul. These attacks sustained a record 47 percent hit on intended targets, an incredible accomplishment in 1940's technology. The short mission ended as the war came to a close and U.S. forces began to extinguish their supplies of drones.

In a July of 1990 letter sent to members of STAG I and the Special Air Task Force, then Secretary of the Navy H. Lawrence Garrett commended the brave men and women for their service to our Nation, honoring, and I quote, "the vision, determination, and dedication with which they performed their secret duties during World War II, which laid the groundwork for today's modern cruise missile."

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the accomplishments of the men of STAG I laid the groundwork for the development of modern-day smart bombs, which has revolutionized American military strategy as well as that of our allies across the globe. Countless lives have been saved through this technology, and our ability to target

enemy installations with precision has proven itself critical in defending our country from ever present threats.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly pleased to rise today in honor of Lieutenant Commander John Burl Hulsey, Sr. I would also like to thank him, his wife, Mary Louise, and members of his family who have joined me in the House gallery this evening to receive this special recognition. His service, while having occurred over 6 decades ago, continues to save the lives of those in the front lines of the war on terror. I thank Lieutenant Commander Hulsey, and will always share a deep respect for this hero's courage, valor, and dedication and service in the United States Navy. And I conclude by congratulating him on his 90th birthday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HELPING THE IRAQIS HELP THEMSELVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, ours is a very generous Nation. As we have seen in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina and the Southeast Asian tsunami, the depth and breadth of American giving is unsurpassed. Our dedication goes far beyond natural disasters, however.

In each of our communities we have seen families reaching out by sending care packages to our troops, or donating school supplies for Iraqi children, or giving to refugee relief organizations. With the support of the Congress, the U.S. government is beginning to follow the path of the American people. Instead of a foreign policy balanced on the tip of a gun, some U.S. programs are reaching out to the people on the ground.

□ 2100

These are the types of programs which should be receiving robust support, not a misguided military agenda without an end game.

The United States Agency for International Development, known as USAID, has several excellent projects that are getting relief into the hands of Iraqi families. We should be helping to rebuild communities because, as the old saying goes, "You break it, you buy it." To be sure, our obligation goes well beyond military and security intervention.

One program deserving note is a USAID grant to get the Balad canning factory up and running again. The factory, one of Iraq's largest food processors, was built in 1974. It was built as

a government-owned tomato paste factory. After privatization, the factory was producing 10 more products and employing 1,000 people, including 200 women.

According to USAID, with the instability that was brought on by the invasion of Iraq and the ensuing civil war, the factory's potential for food processing was shattered. Farmers were unable to work the fields, and the factory no longer had access to the agricultural supply required to operate. Not only were factory workers suddenly unemployed, tens of thousands of farmers found themselves similarly destitute.

A U.S. Government grant for \$5 million will ensure that power, water, waste treatment and steam are restored to the plant. This is essential to get the factory back on-line.

When we look at what we are spending on the military occupation of Iraq, somewhere around \$9 billion a week, \$5 million looks like a drop in the bucket. In fact, \$5 million for development assistance actually equals 21 minutes of military spending. As some of my colleagues like to say, this is a hand up, not a hand-out.

We are rebuilding the heart of communities through jobs, through growth and investment into the infrastructure, the results of which will be seen for generations to come.

We need to take a serious look, Mr. Speaker, at our presence in Iraq. Is it any wonder that there is frustration? We can spend billions of dollars perpetuating an occupation, but we can't truly commit to humanitarian assistance, to reconciliation and a diplomatic surge?

It's simple, if we listen to the American people and to the Iraqi families. Let's end this occupation of Iraq and bring our troops and military contractors home. It is time to rebuild, not reignite a military conflict.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONNELLY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GAS PRICES/TAXES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of high gas prices, high taxes and unnecessary regulation on our lands. As an ardent capitalist, I believe that the marketplace, unencumbered by government regulation, by high taxes, is the best way to control quality, quantity and cost of all goods and services.

The price of gasoline is not immune to market forces. Cutting taxes and

reining in the Federal Government is fundamental to returning power to the U.S. citizens, and to promote economic growth. We should support our free market by eliminating unnecessary regulation, unfair taxes, and promoting the economic growth that we so desperately need. I say, heavy taxation is bad representation.

Speaker PELOSI promised to lower energy prices at the beginning of the 110th Congress. Yet, today the average price of gasoline has gone up \$1.65 per gallon, a nearly 71 percent increase. The Pelosi premium is now costing the average American \$3.98 per gallon of gasoline. And in my district, the 10th Congressional District in Georgia, it's over \$4 a gallon.

Congressional Democrats talk about our addiction to foreign oil, yet they refuse to allow access to American oil and our gas supplies that are necessary to cure this so-called addiction. This is as idiotic as asking Shaquille O'Neal to play basketball on his knees, or Alex Rodriguez hitting a baseball left-handed.

America has been blessed with abundant talent, a tremendous quantity of natural resources. Yet we continue to operate with our knees on the ground and hitting from the wrong side of the plate. Unfortunately, this is not a game that Americans can afford to play.

Developing American oil and gas will help bring prices down and help break the stranglehold on energy that hostile countries in the Middle East enjoy. Yet Congressional Democrats continue to refuse any development whatsoever. We should not be hesitant to tap into our abundant natural resources, especially at a time when energy costs are so high.

Alaska's ANWR is estimated to contain between 5.7 and 16 billion barrels of oil. Yet House Democrats have opposed ANWR exploration 86 percent of the time, while House Republicans have supported responsible and environmentally sound development 91 percent of the time.

The Outer Continental Shelf, OCS, is estimated to contain 19 billion barrels of oil and 84 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Yet House Democrats have opposed developing the OCS 83 percent of the time, while House Republicans have supported responsible and environmentally sound development 81 percent of the time. Today we are drilling for ice on Mars, but we cannot drill for oil in America.

America contains enough oil shale to supply all our needs for over two centuries, estimated at over 2 trillion barrels. Yet House Democrats have opposed oil shale exploration 86 percent of the time, while House Republicans have supported responsible and environmentally sound development 90 percent of the time.

America hasn't built a new oil refinery in decades. It would do little good to increase development of our domestic supplies of oil if we do not have the

refinery capability and capacity to quickly convert this fuel into a usable form. Yet House Democrats have opposed increasing refinery capacity 96 percent of the time, while House Republicans have supported responsible and environmentally sound development 97 percent of the time. We need to streamline getting oil refineries on-line.

America is the Saudi Arabia of coal. We must promote this abundant resource by promoting coal-to-liquids technology. Yet House Democrats have opposed the promotion of coal-to-liquids technology 78 percent of the time, while House Republicans have supported responsible and environmentally sound development 97 percent of the time.

What is the opposition's solution to this national emergency? They have passed a so-called energy bill that's a non-energy bill.

Energy is the lifeblood of the American economy. We need to develop our own natural resources and drill for oil now.

ENERGY SAVINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Democrats have fought to bring America's addiction to oil to the forefront of our national attention for years. We must reduce our dependence on oil in order to stimulate the economy, to protect our country and to curb the harmful effects of global warming.

Since Democrats gained control of the Congress last year, we raised automobile fuel efficiency standards for the first time in over a quarter of a century, despite the opposition of President Bush.

And the House recently passed a comprehensive renewable energy bill. Our renewable energy bill will reduce America's dependence on oil. It will lower energy costs, protect the environment, and create hundreds of thousands of new skilled green jobs all across America.

While Congress is working hard to reduce our oil dependence, my constituents are working hard to do their part to battle rising energy prices and reduce their own carbon footprint.

I recently asked my constituents to tell me what they were doing to reduce their personal energy consumption and to reduce the cost of energy in their monthly lives, and I promised that I would share some of these best ideas right here on the House floor.

Here are some of the comments I've received so far. Many of my constituents are already following some of the more conventional but important methods of energy conservation, including replacing traditional light bulbs with compact fluorescent lights, unplugging appliances that aren't in

use, drying clothes outside in the California sun. Many more are taking advantage of public transportation options throughout Northern California and the San Francisco Bay area.

Patricia Kneisler of Benicia, California, gangs all of her errands together. By doing this, as she says, her "gas guzzler," the 1995 SUV, is only used when absolutely necessary and in the most efficient manner.

Gina Hale's family in Pittsburg, California, attached ultraviolet blocking film on all of the house's windows to cut down on air conditioning costs during the summer.

Melissa Miller of Concord, California runs her dishwasher only when it is full and at night when the electricity rates go down after 7 p.m.

I have posted on my Web site sources of information about how consumers can reduce their energy consumption and save money and help protect the environment. I invite you to visit my Web site. While you're there, post your own comments about your ideas of saving energy. It's at www.georgemiller.house.gov.

Small changes have big impacts. Not only are my constituents reducing their own energy bills, but they're also contributing to our future energy independence.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can and must continue to support all of the individuals who are working to reduce energy consumption. We must work to pass legislation that invests in renewable energy, encourages innovation and investment in green technology and supports the creation of green jobs.

Congress is obligated to move America into the future, into a modern energy policy, and stop the reliance on the past fossil fuels policy that has kept this country in bondage to the oil companies and to the suppliers from overseas. Our economy and our environment depend upon it.

It is a tragedy that President Bush and 12 years of a Republican Congress stood in the way of energy independence, stood in the way of a modern energy program. While the President told the Nation and Congress that we're addicted to oil, he did nothing to alter that addiction—nothing other than to call for more oil drilling. Spoken like a true addict.

Now is the time to move forward. The price of gas and oil is at a crisis to America's families, and we must act quickly and boldly to come to grips with this crisis.

Our future depends upon reducing our demand for oil, increasing energy efficiency, and providing sustainable energy sources to relieve consumers of the crippling energy costs that invade their lives on a daily basis and to stimulate the next generation of innovation.

I appreciate the contributions of my constituents, and I look forward to hearing from more of them and to bring them to the attention of the House to see what decisions they're

making about reducing energy costs in their personal daily lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 2115

IN COMMEMORATION OF TIANANMEN SQUARE PROTEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, today the world commemorates and mourns the events that happened in Tiananmen Square 19 years ago today. It was then that over 2,000 people were massacred by the Communist regime for the crime of quoting Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, the crime of creating a model of the Statue of Liberty, killed for the crime of wanting their God-given right to liberty.

In these 19 years, many things have changed and, sadly, too many people have forgotten.

But there are 130 people that cannot forget. There are 130 people that remain in the communist Chinese prisons for participating in the pro-democracy demonstrations at Tiananmen Square in 1989.

Today, many are told that the communist Chinese regime will one day change. We've heard this for 19 years. We have seen corporate leaders, we have seen elected officials, and regrettably we will soon see the President of the United States go over to Beijing for the Olympics and meet with the butchers that killed 2,000 people, and they continue to imprison 130 of their fellow human beings.

The arguments that will be made in attending this propaganda fest will be that we have to show our respect to the Chinese people; that we have to show them that somehow the United States of America wants to usher in this communist, nuclear-armed dictatorship into the world stage. I find this logic reprehensible.

The United States is a beacon of liberty and hope for all the world suppressed. When the leaders of the United States, be they in business or, more importantly, in the corridors of Congress or in the halls of the White House, attend these communist Olympics, the Chinese people that I am worried about, the Chinese people that I believe we will not be standing behind will be the people who are rotting in the jails for the crime of yearning to be free.

The question then arises, what can we do as a Nation? Many believe the 21st century will be the century of the communist Chinese regime; that their

economy will pass ours; that their rival model of governance will be adopted throughout the world of the corporate structure where one can make money when allowed by the tyrants and that all of your political rights simply do not exist but for the whim of the communist party.

I believe the people who are writing the obituary of the West and of our free Republic are mistaken, and I believe that over time, the voices and the influence of the communist tyrants in Beijing will ring as hollow in the ears of our fellow human beings as once did the callow calls from the halls of the Polit Bureau that the Soviet Union was going to bury the United States.

So as we go forward toward the Olympics, as we go forward from the 19th commemoration of the butchering in Tiananmen Square of the killing of students my own age for wanting the same God-given rights that I and everyone in this country have, let's not forget the 130. Let's demand their release, for if we do not, we will betray not only their liberty, but our professed commitment to being a beacon of hope for all of the world; and we will have squandered the legacy given to us as the custodians of this last best hope of Earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is June 4, 2008 in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Mr. Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,917 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone,

and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution, it says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this Sunset Memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,917 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is June 4, 2008, 12,917 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF CAMERON ARGETSINGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUHLMANN of New York. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans and auto racing enthusiasts around the world look forward to each weekend for the invigorating sights, sounds, and experience of professional sports car racing. These fans owe a great thanks to one of the founding fathers of road racing, Watkins Glen's own Cameron Argetsinger who passed away this last month.

Today I join these fans in mourning the loss of this auto racing pioneer who has left an indelible mark on the automobile world and on the community of Watkins Glen, New York. What Cameron Argetsinger began in 1948 as a road race through and over the streets of Watkins Glen, New York, has grown over the last 60 years to now a private track that has hosted the best drivers in the world, from NASCAR to Formula 1, including the United States Grand Prix.

He has made the small town of Watkins Glen famous throughout the country. Almost every legendary auto racer over the last 60 years has visited Schuylers County to race at the Glen and to pay homage to a man who helped make auto racing what it is today.

Cameron Argetsinger inherited a love for fast cars from his father and in 1947 bought his first sports car so he could become a member of the nascent Sports Car Club of America. With the desire to race his car, he organized a sports car race designed to appear like a European-style road race through the streets of Watkins Glen. That first race in Watkins Glen had only 23 cars participating and followed the route that Cameron Argetsinger laboriously planned on his living room floor.

Ten years later, after the road races moved to a new 2.3-mile course, Argetsinger brought full international races to Watkins Glen. In 1961, he inaugurated the U.S. Grand Prix for Formula 1, which had a successful 20 years' run in the Watkins Glen circuit.

After leaving Watkins Glen in 1970, he was executive vice president of Chaparral Cars and was subsequently director of professional racing and executive director of the Sports Car Club of America, SCCA, from 1971 to 1977. He also served as commissioner of the International Motor Sport Association from 1986 to 1992. Cameron Argetsinger was a member of the inaugural induction class of the Hall of Fame of the Sports Car Club of America in January of 2005. He is also in the Schuylers County, New York, Hall of Fame.

Cameron Argetsinger loved sports cars and never looked back when chasing his dream. He was an attorney, a father, a grandfather, a racer, a husband, and an inspiration. He did what he loved, and he will be missed by the people of Watkins Glen, Schuylers County, and the world.

OUR CONSTITUENTS' NUMBER ONE CONCERN IS THE HIGH PRICE OF OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, recently in my district of Colorado, I had an opportunity to talk to my constituents firsthand about the high cost of gasoline. I decided to go right to the gas station and go up and offer to pump my constituents' gas. Now, this is a very good way to get an honest opinion from someone who, quite frankly, is caught off guard to see a Member of Congress right there willing to pump their gas; and when I introduced myself, some of them recognized me, but others that don't, I introduce myself and I say, Would you like to talk to me about what is on your mind today? And almost to a person, they said, You mean besides the high cost of gasoline? And I knew, after spending a great deal of time at that gas station, that my constituents' number one concern is the high cost of gasoline.

They told me in various ways how its affecting their lives. I talked to one woman, Mr. Speaker, and she was telling me that she had to drive about 20 miles into Graley where she worked, and her fuel bill was getting so high that she literally thought about staying with relatives in town instead of driving the 20 miles each way to get home every night. It was putting such a financial burden on this lady. She was literally thinking about not going home every night but staying in town during the week and going home on the weekend.

I talked to another individual, and he at one time had a fleet of trucks that he operated. He had a trucking business. So he had firsthand knowledge about what the high cost of fuel is doing to the trucking industry. And as he and I stood there and talked, Mr. Speaker, we were remarking that when you go into stores in Colorado and around the Nation, there's an abundance of things on the shelves that we Americans can purchase and enjoy. But what most people don't think about is every one of those items was hauled in a truck. And truckers are experiencing a great deal of hardship lately with the high cost of fuel, and many of them are going out of business.

Now this gentleman that had the trucking business previously now has a trucking repair business, and he told me that the high cost of fuel had adversely affected this business that he had also.

I talked to another gentleman, and he works in Denver, Colorado, but drives from my district up there, and he was telling me that every week he is seeing the cost of gasoline go up and up and up, and he's thinking about how expensive his commute is becoming.

It is quite a burden on families. I talked to another individual that was

older, and he had an older car, and I would presume that he was on a fixed income, Mr. Speaker. And this gentleman doesn't have the opportunity to get another job and work and earn more income. He has this fixed income. As he sees the price of gasoline going up, the cost to heat his home going up, and he, like many other senior citizens, are very concerned about their future and what they're going to do.

I would like to yield time, as much time as she may consume, to the gentelady from Virginia.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to start by thanking the gentelady from Colorado for hosting us this evening and sharing the stories from her own district and the people that she stopped and talked with.

We've just come off our district work period for Memorial Day, and I know all of us at home over these last few days have heard over and over again from our constituents about the extremely high price of gas and how they just can't make that work in their lives and with their incomes. And I was thinking about tonight and coming down here to join you, and I realized this is my fourth year of serving the Congress. That means this has been 4 years that I have been saying the same thing over and over and over again.

In my first 2 years here, I served on the Natural Resource Committee so I had the opportunity to listen. And one thing I learned right away in 2005 that really upset me, because I didn't know this even though I've lived in Virginia now for 41 years; I grew up in northern Ohio and I grew up on Lake Erie, and I found out in 2005 that Canada has been taking natural gas from under Lake Erie since 1913.

I want you to know I never saw a derrick. I never saw any type of a rig. I never had any indication that that was taking place. And I thought, I really felt that I had been misled and that here we are in America blocking getting our own resources and here all along our neighbors are doing it.

And we know today that the one thing that would change the price of gasoline for our citizens, for our constituents, for America, for our businesses is to increase our own domestic supply. The number one issue that would make a difference.

In the 109th Congress, my first 2 years here, we did vote in this House. We voted to open up ANWR. I was surprised in those years when I learned that the National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska—just for a visual for people across America, when I learned that if you visualized that wildlife refuge as RFK stadium, ANWR, where the actual drilling would take place, would be the size of a postage stamp; and that really upset me because that wasn't the mental picture that I had. And I also learned that we have not built a refinery in this country since 1976. Those were all things that I learned in my first year serving here in Congress.

Serving on the Resource Committee, I listened to our neighbors in Canada who came to the Resource Committee to tell us how they were successfully taking oil products from oil shales and oil sand, and they came to volunteer to help us be able to do the same thing. And we still haven't done anything to increase our own domestic resources using yet a third way to do that.

□ 2130

I was fascinated when I would listen to the hearings about using the technology of liquefied coal, that that's old technology, that we can do jet fuel, diesel, gasoline, that would run in all of our engines today by using coal.

America is the Saudi Arabia of coal. Again I question, why are we doing this and why are we making America less competitive? Why are we putting this burden on our citizens?

I met Alaskan citizens who came to talk to me, to beg us to drill in ANWR, and they are the people that live right there.

I think it's time that we had a strategic energy plan. Now, in 2007 and 2008, the discussions that have taken place on this floor about increasing domestic supply have come not because we've brought any sort of strategic plan to the floor. It's come in other pieces of legislation like you saw tonight, in a bill when Representative CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS stood and did a motion to recommit to try to get at the problem that we're all facing in America.

I know that we can protect our environment. I know that we can encourage conservation, that we can incentivize alternative energies as well.

In the Second District of Virginia, we're very proud of one of our universities, Old Dominion University, that is creating biodiesel out of algae. How exciting and interesting is that. They are also doing significant research in what's called coastal energy: wind, wave, solar. But there again, how do we increase our domestic production in our country?

But I also go back to what about families across America. Just before we went on our Memorial Day break, when I got home, when I was sitting there talking to my husband about what was his week like, what was my week like here in D.C., and he said to me, I know you don't know this, but do you know our water bill was \$88 for last month? \$88 just for water.

We both know that in the last 7 years our real estate taxes have tripled, and we're seeing today what we're paying for gasoline, what we're paying for food, and you've explained very, very well about the higher cost of transportation and that we have to move these products.

And that's us sitting there talking. We've lived in our house for 20 years. Our children are grown. How do families do it today? How do families do it that have to commute any distance be-

cause of the price of housing in our country? And more and more people have had to live further out.

If we want America to be competitive, if we want to grow our economy, if we want our families to be able to feel like that they're getting ahead and succeeding, we have got to join together in this Congress. We have to have a bipartisan solution, and we have to increase our domestic supply.

I'm sure that you were as distressed as I was when I read the newspaper article that our President had gone to Saudi Arabia and asked them to increase the gas production. My first thought was, why didn't he come here to Congress and tell us that we must change the law and allow for this domestic production, to allow for the siting of refineries, and to tell the American people that it is the policies right here in Washington that are stopping that from taking place? That's what I would hope that he would do.

I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity. I know you have other speakers. I think you and I could probably talk half the night to America about this issue, about how important it is, but every single person listening to us tonight knows how critically important it is that we increase our domestic supply and that we're able to drop this price and for American families to be able to feel that they can do something, that they can enjoy life and not have to worry and worry how they're going to pay for all the things that are in their lives today. This is something that I feel we, as Members of Congress, could make a difference and could make those changes.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentelady. She has spoken very well about the impact on families with the high price of fuel and what we need to address those prices.

It's interesting, too, as we talk about families, we have schools. In my district, it's 7½ hours from one side of my district to the other. We have rural school districts, and buses have to travel long distances, and now schools are trying to ascertain how they're going to pay the high cost of fuel, and there are changes coming up.

When you look at schools, they're doing things like going to the 4-day week. They're changing. They think of the money they can save if they don't have to transport the kids and heat the buildings and do those things during the day. So when they look at the fuel price for transportation, they're thinking they're going to go to this 4-day week.

Sadly, it's impacting sports and schools, and we know that many times sports is what keeps students in schools, and it has such a good role to play in their life, but they're having to curtail their driving for this because they can't afford it anymore and they might drop programs.

So schools that even want to do field trips, and this is especially enriching for students who perhaps may be in

families where they can't afford to do many things, but these kids enjoy these school trips. These outings are very good for them, but schools are saying that students will have to pay for a fee for that or they will have to forgo their field trips.

This is having a huge impact on families and on schools.

I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. I would like to thank the gentlelady from Colorado for doing this special hour. I don't think there's anything more important facing Americans right now and facing this Congress than to deal with the high cost of energy, and I thank you for your leadership.

With the national average cost of gasoline at the pump today at \$3.98 a gallon, moms and dads across the country are struggling to balance the family budget. It breaks my heart, and I know of a young family back in northeast Tennessee just trying to make enough money to make it to work or take their child to school. It breaks my heart when we have senior adults that are on a fixed income that don't have the opportunity to have more money, to be able to afford the gasoline to go to the doctor or go to the hospital or go to the grocery store. It breaks my heart when you have a small business that's trying to create those jobs and make life better for their fellow man. It breaks my heart.

This Congress must pass meaningful legislation to reduce the price of gasoline and fuel at the pump, and we need to do it soon.

Just recently, Shell Oil Company Chairman John Hofmeister testified before the Senate on why gas prices are so high. He said, "As repetitive and uninteresting as it may sound, the fundamental laws of supply and demand are at work."

Over the past few weeks, I along with most of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have produced an energy policy, not just a piece of an energy policy, but a true energy policy that addresses our supply of American energy. This energy policy explores all facets of our energy needs, from drilling for American oil and natural gases to using alternative fuels like switchgrass and ethanol. The policy increases American supply, which will effectively lower prices.

This energy policy will help people like Earl Humphreys, who owns and manages Lawn Boyz Lawn Care in Bristol, Tennessee. Earl told me that he may not be able to continue his business much longer because of high fuel prices. He is not making enough money to support his family, purchase his fuel, pay his staff, and keep the doors open on his family-run business. How sad.

People like Earl are relying on Congress to do something. Colleagues on this side of the aisle and I have offered nothing but solutions. On the other side of the aisle, they've offered nothing but excuses.

Congress' Democratic leadership is out of touch with the American people like Earl. Instead of increasing American energy supply so that prices can go down and Earl can continue to support his family, the Democrat leadership wants to tax energy producers, stifle American production, and abandon cars, SUVs and pick-up trucks that we all rely on.

Recently, one Congressman proposed a 50-cent tax increase on gasoline. Now, that makes absolutely no sense to me. We can't tax and regulate our way out of an energy crisis, and we can't tax your pick-up truck from empty to full.

Leadership's energy policies have been to conduct seven investigations into price gouging, conduct four investigations on speculators, and create \$20 billion in new taxes on oil producers. Unfortunately, the leadership of Congress' policies don't save Americans any money at the pump.

In fact, gasoline prices have increased from \$2.33 a gallon to \$3.98 per gallon since Speaker PELOSI and her Democrat colleagues took control of this Congress last year. That's not a solution.

When China and other growing industrialized nations are moving from bicycles to cars, Americans are being made to go from cars to bicycles. That's not a solution.

Currently, China is drilling for oil and natural gas almost in sight off the coast of Key West, Florida. The irony here is that while China is out there drilling, America can't, under the leadership of this Congress.

What is it going to take to make this Congress realize that we need to increase American energy supply and decrease our dependence on foreign energy, our dependence on people that hate us and hate our freedoms?

The majority of the American people understand, East Tennesseans understand and I understand, Earl understands and people from Bristol, Tennessee, understand, we must take immediate action to allow for drilling in an environmentally safe way on American soil and off our coasts. In the Outer Continental Shelf alone, it's estimated that we have over 17 billion barrels of oil, oil that someone else is drilling for. On the Arctic National Wildlife Reserve alone, we have the potential to provide consumers with over 1 million barrels of oil per day. We need solutions.

We must take immediate action to allow for the construction of new refineries, and we can do that on old military bases.

We must take immediate action on production of natural gas where our supply is abundant. Eastman Chemical Company, which is located in my district in northeast Tennessee, has been using clean coal gasification to meet their ever increasing energy needs on a daily basis.

We must take immediate action to allow for the construction of safe nuclear power plants. For instance,

France currently powers 80 percent of their energy needs from safe nuclear power plants.

We must take immediate action using alternative fuel sources, like switchgrass and ethanol from nonfood sources. New technologies like switchgrass and ethanol are exciting and will be part of our solution to lower high energy costs.

We must take immediate action by using clean coal technology, something that the Germans used in World War II. This is not futuristic. They were doing it in World War II. Coal is not some smutty leftover from the Industrial Revolution. We have approximately 250 years worth of coal right here in the United States, and you can take a lump of coal and actually turn it into gasoline and drive your car and fly jet planes. They did it in World War II.

We need solutions. Republican energy policies like the ones I've just listed will save every American at least \$1.82 per gallon of gasoline. That's \$36.40 for each 20-gallon tank full of gasoline. Tennesseans like Earl sure can use a \$1.82 discount at the gas pump.

We need solutions. Americans like Earl are looking for solutions, not excuses. The time for solutions is now. That's why I've cosponsored the No More Excuses Energy Act. It combines all these different types of energy to bring down the price at the pump and make sure we have energy to heat our homes in the winter. We need solutions, not excuses.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I would like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania now.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady from Colorado and gentlelady from Virginia and the gentleman from Tennessee for the right to join them this evening for an issue that I think is very much on the mind of every American.

I can't talk to a neighbor, a friend, anywhere but what they're talking about energy prices. And it's interesting that it's not being talked about in this House in a productive way.

In fact, 2 weeks ago we passed a bill that attempts to give us the right to get OPEC into our courts to force them to produce more energy, accusing them of not producing enough energy. Now, I don't know how a government who has locked up so much of its own supply—and I'll show you here on this chart—both coasts are off-limits to oil and gas production and a portion of the gulf. And out in the middle part of the country, millions and millions of acres are locked up.

□ 2145

And of course up here in ANWR, that part of Alaska that was set aside by President Carter for energy production, has been locked up. And we passed a bill in the Clinton administration, and he vetoed it. That was 10 years ago. They said it would take 10 years to get production here, but today we would have that energy if it had happened.

Folks, while we lock this up, we pass a bill trying to get us the ability to bring OPEC countries into a court somewhere to force them to produce. Now, people back home kind of laughed at me and they said, well, how do we force a country to produce when we won't produce our own? How do you rationalize that? But it sounds good if you don't look at the facts, I guess. But here we are, and now the Senate, this week, is working on carbon taxes, which will increase energy prices another 20 to 30 percent.

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, and Americans, listen to the carbon tax debate. It will tax energy further and raise the cost of fossil fuels, hoping, I guess, we won't use them so that we will be forced—and we will get into the renewables in a little bit. But it seems interesting to me that, at a time when every American that I talk to has one thing on their mind, affordable energy, and Congress is the reason. I'm here to say tonight, this body and three Presidents are the reason.

This moratorium on our Outer Continental Shelf, that's from three miles offshore owned by the States to 200 miles that's owned by the Federal Government and us, the taxpayers, we own that. We're the only country in the world that's locked it up. It was locked up 28 years ago by President Bush I for 5 years to study and see where the best was and see if we had some sensitive areas we needed to protect. President Clinton came in, just extended it to 2012 and said they wouldn't explore out there. And then the current President has not supported raising this moratorium. In fact, I wrote him a letter 2 weeks ago, a man I love dearly, but disagree with very much on lack of energy leadership because he understands the energy issue—at least he should, he's from an energy family. But he has spoken three times recently in public about opening up onshore and offshore. So we sent him a letter saying, Mr. President, it seems like if you're serious about opening up offshore, that you would lift the presidential moratorium—because we actually have two moratoriums. We have a presidential decree that's been through three Presidents that says you can't produce out there. We have legislation that Congress passes every year in the Interior bill that says the Federal Government cannot spend one dollar to lease offshore leasing on either coast in the Gulf. Eighty-five percent.

This is where most of the world produces a lot of their energy, these great resources. It's the most environmentally sensitive place. Fishing in the Gulf is better where we produce oil than where we don't produce oil. And when we had the terrible storms in Katrina a few years ago, the fishermen were saying—some of the rigs were really damaged, and the platforms, so they said, you're not going to take them away, are you? They said, no, we're going to repair them and use them. Because that's where the best fishing is.

Now, with those terrible storms, the Minerals and Mines Management said we had no measurable spillage. Actually, we have more spillage on our ocean shores from ships and sporting boats than we have from drilling anywhere. We have not had an offshore incident since 1969 in Santa Barbara. Our technology today is tremendously improved. There is no viable reason that we're not producing energy offshore.

Now, I'll be offering an amendment next Wednesday, the 11th of June, in the Interior Appropriations bill that will open up and remove these moratoriums from 50 miles out for both gas and oil. That will allow us to produce. Now, it's not something that's just going to happen overnight, it still would have to be, once it's opened up and signed by the President, it would have to be part of the 5-year plan.

What's interesting is we know there's huge reserves out here, but has never been measured by modern seismicographic and modern techniques that we use today. And it's like taking an old black and white picture tube, television, and comparing it to one of our beautiful flat screen TVs today of what you can see. Today they can know what's there, what type of energy is there, how deep it is, and how difficult it will be to produce it. But we, by law, this Congress has prohibited anybody from exploring out there, even to look at what's out there. Does that make sense? Of course it makes no sense.

Let's look for a moment at our energy use. This is the interesting part. We are 40 percent petroleum, 23 percent natural gas, 23 percent coal, 8 percent nuclear. Now, that's 94 percent of America's energy. That's fossil fuel, except nuclear.

Then you have the renewables. And, you know, I'm for wind and I'm for solar and I'm for geothermal and I'm for cellulosic ethanol and all of those good things, but we have to look at how small they are. I said to a gentleman on the plane this morning flying in, I said, if we double wind and solar in the next 5 years, how much of our energy do you think—oh, 10 percent? I said, less than three-quarters of 1 percent. Because when you get down here, the only one that's really grown a lot recently is woody biomass.

Now, we have almost a million Americans now, just under a million Americans heats their homes with pellet stoves; that's saw dust pressed into a pellet, and they use it to heat their home. We're heating factories today with saw dust and wood chips. I have a hospital in my district that just put in a new wood boiler that has saved 70 percent on their energy bill by burning sawdust and wood chips and their own cardboard and their own paper. So that's been the one that's been growing. Geothermal has been just constant at a very small fraction.

Wind and solar are fractions; these are fractions. Now, if we double them, they're still fractions. And I'm for them. But I guess the false hope has

been—and I want to share with you who I think is really at fault. Now, Congress is at fault, but who has influenced Congress? Well, there is a group called the Sierra Club. And here is what is on their web page. They're against the oil shale development that's been talked about out west, where we think there's huge reserves. They're against coal liquefaction because we're the Saudi Arabia of coal and we think liquefied coal or coal-to-gas could get us away from the—66 percent of our petroleum now comes from foreign unstable governments. And that's where all our money is going, folks. We're enriching that part of the world who helped furnish us with 9/11.

They're against offshore energy production. Back to the map I had up here. The Sierra Club will lead the fight. I debated a Sierra Club member on NPR last week on a California radio station, and they said we'll be leading the fight to stop Congressman PETERSON's bill from being passed.

Green Peace; you know what they want to do? They want to phase these out. And that's what a lot of Congress wants to do. They say, we can't use fossil fuels anymore. Well, okay, I'll buy that. I would like to be fueling our country down here. I will do anything and everything to fund these. And those who say we haven't spent billions on research in wind and solar are not being honest with you, we're spending billions annually to subsidize those.

So Green Peace wants to phase these out; can't do this anymore. But that's really what we're doing, that's why we have high energy prices; we're phasing out fossil fuels before we have a replacement. We've decided we're not going to produce fossil fuels. Because if we don't produce them—I've talked to Members here on the floor. Well, John, if we continue to produce fossil fuels and they're affordable, Americans will not use renewables. I said, but if you phase out fossil fuels before we have the renewables, we're going to have awfully high energy prices.

Now, we were arguing that when oil was \$30 and \$40 a barrel. I don't think any of us dreamed we would see \$135 oil this year. I thought we might hit \$100 oil this fall. That was my prediction. I did not dream . . .

Now, what's interesting that's happening now, oil I think was \$122 when it closed today; that's not cheap, but it's better than \$135. But natural gas prices, creeping, creeping, creeping. And natural gas is the fuel that I think is the bridge fuel.

Here's what natural gas prices have been doing. Natural gas prices are spiking again. This chart was made on the retail price. Today, natural gas was \$12.40 out of the ground. And now what's ironic about that, this is a time of year when you don't use a lot of natural gas because you're minimizing heating and you're minimizing cooling. You're kind of at the period where we depend on natural temperatures. So we use much less natural gas at this time

of year. So this is when natural gas prices dive. And we put that cheap gas in the ground and we use it next winter because in the winter time, when we're heating the country, we can't produce enough gas for that period of time, so we store it. And my district has many caverns, salt caverns where we store gas for the northeast.

So we're now putting \$12.40 gas in the ground for next winter. Last year at this time we were putting \$6.50 and \$7 gas in the ground. So the American public yet do not realize that we've had—they're paying very high prices for home heating oil, they're paying very high prices for gasoline and diesel, and they're paying very high prices for home heating oil and propane. But natural gas didn't increase much last year; it was kind of a soft year on natural gas prices. But this year, only the good Lord knows how expensive it's going to be because it appears, for some reason, it's going up like a quarter a day; so that's every four days you're up a dollar. I don't know what's causing it, it's increased use.

We have said no to about 50 coal plants that were designed to be built to replace old coal plants in the last 6 months in this country. States have rejected them because of the carbon issue now, or the fear of the carbon issue. So those will all be natural gas plants.

Now, up until about 12 years ago we didn't use natural gas to make electricity, and so we made about 8 percent of our electricity with natural gas. And that was peak power in the morning and the evening because you can turn a gas generator off and on, the rest you can't. Now that we use it unlimitedly, we're at 23 percent of our electric is being produced with natural gas. And it's a huge strain on the natural gas system.

Now, natural gas should never be a problem in America. We can't probably produce all the oil we need; we can do a lot better than we're doing. But there's no reason America can't have lots of natural gas. We have reserves onshore, offshore, but unfortunately most of them are owned by government entities and they're locked up. Congress has locked them up. Congress has said we're not going to produce. And these environmental groups—let me go back through them. Green Peace; phase out fossil fuels. Environmental Defense; they're against power plant smokestacks are public health enemy number one, so you can't have a power plant. League of Conservation Voters; coal to liquids, the wrong direction. They're going to fight it. Defenders of Wilderness; every coastal State is put in harm's way when oil rigs go up on our coastal waters.

Folks, I showed you the chart earlier about every country in the world, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Ireland, Great Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, they all produce offshore, cleanly. The new technology, they turn the wells off when there are storms at the base. There has not been a major spill.

And there has never been a gas spill that spoiled a beach. Gas is a clean fuel.

And in my view, if we had abundant reasonable natural gas, we could fuel a third of our cars with natural gas. In the cities, our buses, all our short-haul vehicles, our construction vehicles, could all be on clean, green natural gas. But the price is so high today, there is no incentive to do that.

To conclude here, here is the Energy Department's charts. The middle is now. This is history. This is what they project for our usage in the future.

Now, not long ago there were commercials on television by oil companies that led me to believe that renewables were ready to take over, they were ready to fuel this country, all we had to do was release them. Well, this is what the Energy Department thinks. Not much changed. Now, I don't quite agree with some of these. I think natural gas will increase measurably out here because the carbon issue is going to restrict coal. It may prevent us from doing coal-to-liquid. And it shouldn't happen, but it's actually happening. Coal plants are being turned down—clean coal technology plants are being turned down by environmental agencies to replace all dirty coal plants that we would like to replace because of the carbon issue.

So I look for gas to be—if we do a carbon tax, every country that has done a carbon tax, everybody has to go to natural gas because it's a third of the carbon when you burn it of any other fossil fuel. It's the cleanest fuel, it's almost the perfect fuel. But folks, we need oil, we need gas, we need coal, we need nuclear. We need all the renewables and hydros. And we need to grow them all as fast as we can. But our environmental groups want to eliminate all of the below and run the country on above. And it actually goes clear up to here, because they're not for nuclear. The environmental groups are not for nuclear, they're not for coal, they're not for gas, they're not for oil. But folks, that's how we run the world.

And with today's clean technology, there is no argument why we can't have affordable energy in America.

□ 2200

But it is the will of this Congress to open up. I hope next Wednesday on the Interior Subcommittee that we can be successful with our amendment that would open up the Outer Continental Shelf, from 50 miles out, to oil and gas production. Now, that won't change anything, but I just asked some oil company executives, who I don't talk to often but who were at a hearing, if we opened up the Outer Continental Shelf in its entirety, both coasts, and we opened up ANWR, what would that do to energy prices? He said, well, it would take the fear factor out because here is the problem we have in America.

Historically, there was capacity in the world of about 10 million gallons a

day of oil that could be pumped if we needed it, from eight to ten. That has been historic. Recently, as China and India have increased their usage and as many of the countries—Mexico, Chavez, Nigeria, Russia, and all of them—have nationalized their oil companies and are now run by the government, they are not being run as efficiently, and they're not producing as much, so production has actually slipped in many of those countries.

We are down now to where there is about a 1.2-million-extra-barrel-a-day capacity in the world to meet the world demand. So, if you have a storm and when Exxon was arguing with Chavez over producing, the price went up. When we had the oil refinery a short time ago that was only a 78,000-barrel refinery, the price went up. Why? Because that is going to take some supply off the market. There is no slush. So, if you have any one of these countries—these dictatorships—topple and instead of producing 7 million barrels a day they would produce 5, there wouldn't be enough oil. So the fear factor allows Wall Street to play on those fears and run those prices up. If you took the fear factor out, the oil companies told me, it would probably reduce prices at least 20 to 25 percent. That's just theory. That's their thought. Take the fear factor because there is not enough oil in the marketplace.

What has happened and no matter what we do is China's growth in energy use and India's growth in energy use is 15 to 20 percent a year because, as they build a home and buy their first vehicles, they are now in the energy business. Where they used to have a donkey and a hut, they now have a house. Millions of people all over the world are joining our way of life, and to join our way of life, they need heat in their homes; they need a vehicle that needs fuel, and they're part of the energy business. Those are the developing countries in South America, in India, in China, in Malaysia. It's happening everywhere. We are soon going to be the second biggest user of energy because China is about ready to go by us.

I believe, if America continues to refuse to deal with energy and bring available energy to America, we will not compete in the new global economy. We are in an economy today where we have never had competitors like China and India before. We have never had this kind of pressure on us. We have to compete.

I want to make one final point on natural gas. Natural gas is not a world price. We have had one of the highest prices of any country in the world of natural gas now for 8 years. That is why half the fertilizer industry has left this country; they use huge amounts of natural gas. I'll just share with you some data here that's scary.

Dow Chemical announced a 20 percent price increase, but it's what you look at behind that that's scary. In 2002, their natural gas bill was \$8 billion. In 2008, it was \$32 billion. That's

four times. In 2002, 60 percent of their revenues came from American plants. Just a few years later, it was only 34 percent of their revenues. Why? They had to move offshore to compete in the global economy. Over half the fertilizer companies have left America in the last 3 years because of natural gas prices. The increase in the cost of natural gas has caused plastic resin prices to rise to record levels. It has put American-based plastic facilities—and my district is full of plastic plants—at a severe competitive disadvantage, says Josh Young of the American Plastics Council. As a result, the factories are closing or are moving offshore. They are leaving Americans jobless. Over the past 5 years, the plastic industry has lost nearly 4,000 jobs in Florida, which refused to allow us to drill, and more than 300,000 jobs nationwide just in the plastics industry. Petrochemicals have lost hundreds of thousands of jobs, fertilizer thousands of jobs and steel makers, aluminum makers and glass that use huge amounts.

My prediction is that bulk commodities like glass and bricks, that should always be made close to home, will soon be made in Trinidad where gas is \$1.50 instead of \$12 coming out of the ground. We will make our bricks and glass in Trinidad, South America. It will come here in about a day and a half on a ship.

That's not the America I dream for. Available, affordable energy is available to us if this Congress will do what is right: Open up offshore, do coal to liquids, expand the use of nuclear, continue to subsidize the renewables and to incentivize the renewables. I think we also need to incentivize Americans. I mean Americans are conserving. They have to conserve, but we need to incentivize Americans with tax breaks that would help them write off any measurable improvement they made in their homes and in their lifestyles, whether it's heating their homes with more modern appliances or whether it's better insulation or better windows or better doors, so we can conserve the use of energy.

As was talked about here on the floor earlier, there is education. My school districts are getting hammered with energy costs. The hospitals are getting hammered with energy costs as are your agencies that give free aid to the people. I mean every social agency is getting hammered with energy costs.

I talked to a church person tonight who said they weren't sure they were going to be able to keep their church open next winter. The energy bills last year have made it almost prohibitive to keep their church open in the colder months in the winter. They are going to have to find a place to meet somewhere else.

Folks, this is a self-induced problem by this Congress and by three Presidents. In our Presidential debate, the number one issue ought to be who has the best plan for available, affordable energy for America.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Virginia.

Mrs. DRAKE. Well, first, I'd like to thank the gentleman for that very thorough explanation to America as to what is really going on. I was very proud to stand beside you several months ago when you did your press conference on your bill. There were several of our colleagues there—original cosponsors on your bill—standing with you.

I'll never forget standing with you as well were representatives from Dow Chemical because they made an announcement, too. They told us that they were doing a \$30 billion expansion in China, Saudi Arabia and Libya, 10,000 jobs that they wished were right here in America. The reason they did it was because you couldn't pay \$10 to \$12 for a unit of gas here that you could pay 85 cents for in Saudi Arabia. I've never forgotten that. I thought it was very, very painful.

Your bill as well does something that is very important. It has a 37½ percent royalty back to the State. Now, the Commonwealth of Virginia desperately needs that kind of funding for our number one issue of transportation. Your bill also fully funds the Chesapeake Bay Commission's request for the bay cleanup. So there are ways that we can be environmentally protective and that we can be environmentally sound.

You brought up various environmental groups, and I wanted to say to you that I was going to speak to the Natural Resources Committee one day about why I support deep sea drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. I represent the entire Atlantic coast in Virginia. Well, there was someone there from one of our environmental groups whom I knew. I went up to him, and I said, "I know if you're speaking you're going to say the exact opposite of me, but what I really want to ask you is: Do you understand the impact that you have on our economy or is that your point?" He actually acted like I'd hit him. I said, "No, no, no. Wait. I'm really serious. I'm trying to understand what the issue is, but I truly believe you either don't know or you intend to do it." Do you know what? He turned and he walked away and he wouldn't answer me, but we cannot as leaders in our country stand back and allow this to take place.

I just wanted to finish up with a couple of facts that I found very interesting. One is, if we were to increase that nuclear that you have on there, we could keep 200 billion tons of carbon out of our atmosphere annually if we simply had the nuclear capability of France.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. That's right.

Mrs. DRAKE. The second thing is that we're 13 times more likely to have a spill if we transport oil product by tanker. I think that's important for America to know.

There is another that you've said, that it has been over 30 years, almost 40, since there has been any significant spill from any sort of deep sea drilling. We all saw what happened with Katrina and Rita. There were no problems there. We know Canada has an oil rig in the north Atlantic, off the coast of Newfoundland, called Hibernia. There have been no problems there. As you have said, the technology is so much better.

The other important thing is the horizon is only 12 miles out. You're talking 50 miles from Virginia Beach. That's half the way to Richmond. So there is no way you would ever see a rig.

I want to thank you because you have done just a tremendous job of bringing this issue to the forefront and of explaining it to America, and I truly believe that when Americans have the facts and Americans understand this issue that Americans will be demanding of us as Members of the House and as Members of the Senate that we deal with this issue. I really hope that they call their Representatives all across America, that they phone and tell their Representatives and demand that we deal with this issue and not make America less competitive.

I keep talking about families. What about single parents? How do you deal with this incredible cost? You have brought it up. It is something that we have been extremely concerned about, the price of natural gas for home heating, and we have been very fortunate in our area to have milder than normal winters. That has not been the case across the country. So thank you.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman and yield back to her as well.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I thank you both for your expertise in this area and also Mr. DAVIS as he spoke this evening.

Mr. PETERSON, your charts and the case that you presented tonight are very clear before the American people. We all have a desire to go to alternatives. We all want to lessen our dependence on foreign oil. You talked about that 40 percent. 60 percent of that comes from very unstable areas of the world, and we know that, and we want to lessen that dependence that we have on them and become energy-independent, but this is a long road. We have to start right now, right here today, for the American people who are suffering with the high cost of energy.

I would just challenge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. We talk about long-range planning. We always have to do long-range planning. We need to look at the big picture. Today are the solutions that the Republicans have come forth with—more domestic exploration. You have spoken so well, Mr. PETERSON, to our Nation's being locked up, but nations around the world do energy exploration off their coasts in an environmentally sound way. There is no reason that America should not be doing that.

Look at the States like I am from, Colorado. There are abundant natural

resources that we have, and there are the technologies that are available now with oil shale, and there is the future we have on that. We need to get to work on that right away.

You and I have talked and all of us have talked this evening about the lack of refinery capacity and how we can look clear back to the 1970s. We have not had any refineries built since then. We need to get away from this failed policy and get real in this country about what we need to do.

When I was at the pump, when I was talking to those people in Greeley, Colorado the other day, I saw firsthand how this is affecting the middle class, people who have to drive back and forth to work. You know, they want to be able to take their children to the baseball games this summer. They want their kids to participate in these things and to enjoy their summer in Colorado, but they are very worried. My folks who are on fixed incomes are very concerned about how they are going to get back and forth to the grocery store and to the doctor and how they will run the errands that they need to do. We need to respond as Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, to this crisis that is right here now before our middle class, and we need to bring forth these solutions that we have suggested tonight to bring down the cost of energy.

It is time for Congress to act, and every day that goes by that we do not enact sound policies that will allow us to do domestic exploration in an environmentally sound way—yes, move to alternatives, do these things that we need to do, increase refinery capacity—we are letting the American people down. I am standing tonight with my colleagues to say it is time to address this problem for the middle class and for the United States and to get on the road to energy independence but, in the here and now, to bring down the cost of energy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHABOT (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 12 p.m. on account of his son's high school graduation.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today and June 5.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 11.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONAWAY, for 5 minutes, June 5.

Mr. KUHLMANN of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, June 9, 10, and 11.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2162. An Act to improve the treatment and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder and substance use disorders, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 5, 2008, at 9:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6889. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-371, "E.W. Stevenson, Sr. Boulevard Designation Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6890. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-372, "Closing Agreement Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6891. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-373, "Lower Income Homeownership Cooperative Housing Association Re-Clarification Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6892. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-375, "Gerard W. Burke, Jr. Building Designation Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6893. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-376, "District of Columbia School Reform Property Disposition Clarification Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6894. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-377, "Bicycle Policy Modernization Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6895. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-378, "So Others Might East Property Tax Exemption Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6896. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-379, "Department of Small and Local Business Development Subcontracting Clarification, Benefit Expansion, and Grant-making Authority Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6897. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-380, "East of the River Hospital Revitalization Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6898. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-381, "Film DC Economic Incentive Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6899. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-382, "Student Voter Registration Temporary Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6900. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-383, "Veterans Rental Assistance Temporary Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6901. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-385, "Vacancy Exemption Repeal Temporary Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6902. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-384, "Howard Theatre and 7th Street, N.W., Revitalization Grants Authorization Temporary Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6903. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-386, "Cigarette Stamp Clarification Temporary Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6904. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-387, "Supplemental Appropriations Release of Funds Temporary Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6905. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-394, "Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6906. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. ACT 17-395, "Child Abuse and Neglect Investigation Record Access Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6907. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-396, "Child and Family Services Grant-Making Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6908. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-397, "Abe Pollin Way Designation Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6909. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-398, "Omnibus Alcoholic Beverage Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6910. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-399, "Pre-k Enhancement and Expansion Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6911. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-400, "Dr. Vincent E. Reed Auditorium Designation Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6912. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-401, "Closing of Public Alleys, the Opening of Streets, and the Dedication and Designation of Land for Street and Alley Purposes in Squares 6123, 6125, and 6126 S.O. 06-4886, Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6913. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-402, "Expanding Opportunities for Street Vending Around the Baseball Stadium Temporary Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6914. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-388, "Rev. M. Cecil Mills Way Designation Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6915. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-389, "Ethel Kennedy Bridge Designation Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6916. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-390, "District of Columbia Medical Liability Captive Insurance Agency Establishment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6917. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 17-374, "Washington Convention Center Authority Advisory Committee Amendment Act of 2008," pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6918. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior,

transmitting the Department's final rule — Texas Regulatory Program [SATS No. TX-058-FOR; Docket No. OSM-2007-0018] received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6919. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Less Than 60 feet (18.3 m) LOA Using Jig or Hook-and-Line Gear in the Bogoslof Pacific Cod Exemption Area in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 070213033-7033-01] (RIN: 0648-XF62) received April 30, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6920. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 070213032-7032-01] (RIN: 0648-XF49) received May 2, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6921. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 071106673-8011-02] (RIN: 0648-XH03) received April 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6922. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Amendment 15 to the Pacific Coast Salmon Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 061219338-7494-03] (RIN: 0648-AU69) received March 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6923. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Quota Transfer [Docket No. 071030625-7696-02] (RIN: 0648-XH32) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6924. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2008 Management Measures and a Temporary Rule [Docket No. 080428611-8612-01] (RIN: 0648-AW60) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6925. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast (NE) Multispecies Fishery; Modification of the Yellowtail Flounder Landing

Limit for the U.S./Canada Management Area [Docket No. 0401120010-4114-02] (RIN: 0648-XH45) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6926. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Tilefish Fishery; Quota Harvested for Part-Time Category [Docket No. 010319075-1217-02] (RIN: 0648-XF92) received May 18, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6927. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish Fishery; Framework Adjustment 5 to the Monkfish Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 071128763-8490-02] (RIN: 0648-AW33) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6928. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Amendment 11 [Docket No. 071130780-8013-02] (RIN: 0648-AU32) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6929. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Deep-Water Species Fishery by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 071106671-8010-02] (RIN: 0648-XH35) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6930. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 071106673-8011-02] (RIN: 0648-XH36) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6931. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No. 060824226-6322-02] (RIN: 0648-AW58) received May 14, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6932. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries in the Western Pacific; Bottomfish and Seamount Groundfish Fisheries; Fishery Closure [Docket No. 071211828-8448-02] (RIN: 0648-XG90) received April 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6933. A letter from the Acting Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of

Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Closure of the 2008 Commercial Fishery for Tilefishes [Docket No. 040205043-4043-01] (RIN: 0648-XG71) received May 20, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6934. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of a report required by Section 202(a)(1)(C) of Pub. L. 107-273, the "21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act," related to certain settlements and injunctive relief, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D Public Law 107-273, section 202; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6935. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the report of the Attorney General regarding activities initiated pursuant to the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during fiscal year 2007, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1997f; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6936. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report providing an estimate of the dollar amount of claims (together with related fees and expenses of witnesses) that, by reason of the acts or omissions of free clinic health professionals will be paid for 2009, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 233(o); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6937. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of draft legislation that would provide for the supervision of those under the United States Parole Commission's jurisdiction after the current authority expires on October 31, 2008; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6938. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Fiscal Year 2007 Annual Report, pursuant to the "21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act," Pub. L. 107-273; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6939. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps, transmitting the annual and financial reports for the year 2007, pursuant to Public Law 87-655; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6940. A letter from the Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting notification that funding under Title V, subsection 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, as amended, has exceeded \$5 million for the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA-3284-EM in the State of Texas, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6941. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's position on budgeting for the Federal navigation improvement project at Akutan Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6942. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on recommendations of the Secretary that have not been provided to Congress, pursuant to Public Law 110-114, section 2033(g)(2); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6943. A letter from the Director of Civil Works, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources — received May 22, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6944. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's feasibility report for hurricane and storm damage reduction at Pawleys Island, South Carolina; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6945. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's feasibility report on the flood damage reduction opportunities for the communities of Cynthiana, Millersburg, and Paris, in the Licking River Basin, Kentucky; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6946. A letter from the Acting Administrator, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a letter regarding a resolution adopted by the National Dam Safety Review Board; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6947. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the determination that a waiver of the application of subsections (a) and (b) of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to the Republic of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 110-120); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 135. A bill to establish the Twenty-First Century Water Commission to study and develop recommendations for a comprehensive water strategy to address future water needs; with an amendment (Rept. 110-504 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 5972. A bill to make technical corrections to the laws affecting certain administrative authorities of the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1343. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide additional authorizations of appropriations for the health centers program under section 330 of such Act; with an amendment (Rept. 110-680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DINGELL: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5669. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the poison center national toll-free number, national media campaign, and grant program to provide assistance for poison prevention, sustain the funding of poison centers, and enhance the public health of people of the United States (Rept. 110-681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 5940. A bill to authorize activities for support of nanotechnology research and development, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-682). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania: Committee on House Administration. H.R. 5893. A bill to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110-683 Pt. 1).

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 3916. A bill to provide for the next generation of border and maritime security technologies; with an amendment (Rept. 110-684 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 5770. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Sciences of potential impacts of climate change on water resources and water quality (Rept. 110-685 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5893 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 6175. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to provide vouchers for the purchase of educational books for infants and children participating in the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children under that Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 6176. A bill to authorize the expansion of the Fort Davis National Historic Site in Fort Davis, Texas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ:

H.R. 6177. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to modify the boundary of the Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. MCCOTTER):

H.R. 6178. A bill to strengthen existing legislation sanctioning persons aiding and facilitating nonproliferation activities by the governments of Iran, North Korea, and Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAMP of Michigan (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. HULSHOF):

H.R. 6179. A bill to encourage and enhance the adoption of interoperable health information technology to improve health care quality, reduce medical errors, and increase the efficiency of care; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICHAUD (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAHALL,

Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. HALL of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SOLIS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KAGEN, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio):

H.R. 6180. A bill to require a review of existing trade agreements and renegotiation of existing trade agreements based on the review, to set terms for future trade agreements, to express the sense of the House of Representatives that the role of Congress in trade policymaking should be strengthened, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself and Mr. PUTNAM):

H.R. 6181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow certain current and former service members to receive a refundable credit for the purchase of a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.R. 6182. A bill to convey the New River State Park campground located in the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area in the Jefferson National Forest in Carroll County, Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 6183. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to remove the tariffs on ethanol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 6184. A bill to provide for a program for circulating quarter dollar coins that are emblematic of a national park or other national site in each State, the District of Columbia, and each territory of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LATTA:

H.R. 6185. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for continuity of TRICARE Standard coverage for certain members of the Retired Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARKEY:

H.R. 6186. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program to decrease emissions of greenhouse gases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and

Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Science and Technology, Natural Resources, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Education and Labor, Transportation and Infrastructure, Oversight and Government Reform, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington):

H.R. 6187. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 424 University Way NE. in Seattle, Washington, as the "Jacob Lawrence Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER (for himself and Mr. UDALL of Colorado):

H.R. 6188. A bill to authorize certain private rights of action under the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 for violations by foreign concerns that damage domestic businesses; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 6189. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a "Charter Forest" demonstration project on all National Forest System lands in the State of Colorado in order to combat insect infestation, improve forest health, reduce the threat of wildfire, protect biological diversity, and enhance the social sustainability and economic productivity of the lands; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 6190. A bill to restore to the Department of State responsibility over the Police Training Teams being used to provide advisory support, training and development, and equipment for the Iraqi Police Service, to require the Department of State to provide the majority of members for the Police Training Teams, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOUCHER:

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution commending the Barter Theatre on the occasion of its 75th anniversary; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CARSON:

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution recognizing May 2, 2008, as the 88th anniversary of the first National Negro League baseball game; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H. Res. 1236. A resolution expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives to the citizens of Black Hawk, Buchanan, Butler, and Delaware Counties, Iowa, who were victims of the devastating tornado that struck their communities on May 25, 2008; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. LEE, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia,

Mr. HONDA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HARE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BACA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. REYES, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H. Res. 1237. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of Juneteenth Independence Day, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that history should be regarded as a means for understanding the past and more effectively facing the challenges of the future; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. RICHARDSON:

H. Res. 1238. A resolution congratulating the University of California, Los Angeles, men's basketball team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association tournament performance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself and Mrs. CAPPS):

H. Res. 1239. A resolution honoring the life of Jacques-Yves Cousteau, explorer, researcher, and pioneer in the field of marine conservation; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H. Res. 1240. A resolution providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 111) establishing a Select Committee on POW and MIA Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Res. 1241. A resolution congratulating Ensign DeCarol Davis upon serving as the valedictorian of the Coast Guard Academy's class of 2008 and becoming the first African American female to earn this honor; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

289. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5 urging the Congress of the United States to pass effective and meaningful immigration reform to enhance the workforce of Utah and continue the economic strength of the state's business environment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

290. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 179 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the Clean Boating

Act of 2008; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 89: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 111: Mr. KELLER.
 H.R. 207: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 273: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 303: Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 343: Mr. McHUGH.
 H.R. 552: Mr. HELLER and Mr. SALLI.
 H.R. 555: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 643: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 677: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 678: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 688: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
 H.R. 741: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 826: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 882: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. HODES, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 1029: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 1108: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 1110: Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. PUTNAM.
 H.R. 1111: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 1148: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 1193: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 1222: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H.R. 1223: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 1228: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 1295: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 1306: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
 H.R. 1320: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 1321: Mr. BILBRAY.
 H.R. 1338: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 1376: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 1390: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 1475: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1524: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 1542: Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 1551: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 1590: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 1755: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 1801: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. HARMAN.
 H.R. 1884: Mr. HODES and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 1912: Mr. HONDA.
 H.R. 2020: Mr. GERLACH.
 H.R. 2131: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 2140: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H.R. 2233: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 2267: Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.
 H.R. 2371: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 2493: Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 2502: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 2511: Ms. HOOLEY.
 H.R. 2530: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
 H.R. 2552: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 2580: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 2606: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2686: Mr. CAZAYOUX.
 H.R. 2729: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2734: Mr. SCALISE and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 2784: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
 H.R. 2820: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 2832: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2864: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Ms. HIRONO.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. CAMPBELL of California and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2914: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 3232: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 3234: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 3257: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 3273: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 3326: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 3395: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 3457: Mr. HENSARLING and Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 3543: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 3631: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 3654: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 3663: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 3686: Mr. WU.
 H.R. 3700: Ms. SUTTON.
 H.R. 3717: Mr. ALTMIRE.
 H.R. 3757: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 3834: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 3929: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 3934: Ms. GIFFORDS and Ms. TSONGAS.
 H.R. 4030: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H.R. 4053: Mr. HINCHY.
 H.R. 4055: Mr. MCNERNEY.
 H.R. 4061: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 4113: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 4114: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4181: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 4188: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 4199: Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. REGULA.
 H.R. 4206: Ms. DELAUNO and Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 4207: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 4236: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 4251: Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 4318: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H.R. 4335: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4461: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4544: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 4651: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4827: Mrs. CAPITO.
 H.R. 4897: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
 H.R. 4900: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 4926: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. McHUGH.
 H.R. 4990: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 5028: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 5129: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 5179: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 5244: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5265: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 5315: Mr. HINCHY and Mr. SESTAK.
 H.R. 5404: Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 5447: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H.R. 5454: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 5461: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 5469: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 5516: Ms. SCHWARTZ.
 H.R. 5541: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 5546: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 5549: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 5559: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 5573: Mr. WELLER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SHULER.
 H.R. 5632: Mr. COHEN and Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 5662: Ms. GIFFORDS.
 H.R. 5673: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 5674: Mr. CLEAVER.
 H.R. 5686: Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 5698: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 5705: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CARSON, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 5709: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H.R. 5734: Mr. NADLER and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 5737: Mr. GOODE and Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 5748: Mr. MELANCON.
 H.R. 5752: Mr. WOLF.
 H.R. 5755: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.
 H.R. 5762: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 5772: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 5775: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.R. 5793: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
 H.R. 5794: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 5797: Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 5804: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
 H.R. 5823: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 5825: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 5827: Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.
 H.R. 5833: Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H.R. 5839: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 5852: Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 5854: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BUYER, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. MCCOTTER.
 H.R. 5892: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
 H.R. 5893: Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 5894: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.
 H.R. 5898: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HARE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MACK, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TERRY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BOYD of Florida.
 H.R. 5901: Mr. COHEN.
 H.R. 5924: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 5940: Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H.R. 5949: Mr. KAGEN, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 5954: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 5970: Ms. SCHWARTZ and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 5971: Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
 H.R. 5984: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. KUHLMAN of New York, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 6002: Ms. WATSON.
 H.R. 6026: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 6030: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mr. KUHLMAN of New York.
 H.R. 6034: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 6053: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 6063: Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. WU, and Mr. MELANCON.
 H.R. 6064: Mr. KIND, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 6065: Mr. CARNAHAN and Mrs. BIGGERT.
 H.R. 6076: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 6078: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 6087: Mr. BROUN of Georgia.
 H.R. 6092: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. BONNER.
 H.R. 6101: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 6102: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 6108: Mr. CANNON and Mrs. BACHMANN.
 H.R. 6122: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 6160: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. HODES.
 H.J. Res. 39: Mr. WOLF.
 H.J. Res. 79: Mr. SIRES.
 H.J. Res. 84: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H. Con. Res. 223: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
 H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. SESTAK.
 H. Con. Res. 299: Ms. CASTOR, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. HONDA.
 H. Con. Res. 338: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 342: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BERRY, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. WEXLER.

H. Con. Res. 350: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. KENNEDY.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. HERGER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ISSA, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. MARCHANT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PENCE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 362: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. POE, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. VIS-CLOSKY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RENZI, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. GOODE, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. HAYES, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HOYER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. WAMP.

H. Con. Res. 367: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr.

McGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KIND, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H. Res. 353: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. BERRY.

H. Res. 356: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H. Res. 648: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

H. Res. 896: Mr. SESTAK and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H. Res. 985: Mr. HILL, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H. Res. 988: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. CASTLE.

H. Res. 1010: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. COHEN.

H. Res. 1056: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 1105: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H. Res. 1108: Mr. HELLER.

H. Res. 1143: Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 1187: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 1191: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. ALLEN.

H. Res. 1192: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. SPEIER.

H. Res. 1202: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HILL, Ms. HOOLEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 1219: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Res. 1227: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. McGOVERN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

252. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Douglas County, Nebraska, relative to Resolution No. 143 opposing any cutback of the National Institute of Correction's budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

253. Also, a petition of American Bar Association, relative to a resolution regarding prosecutor obligation regarding new exculpatory evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

254. Also, a petition of American Bar Association, relative to a resolution regarding criminal standards on prosecutorial investigations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.